528

The CASE of the ROYAL MARTYR Confidered with CANDOUR;

OR, AN

ANSWER

TO

SOME LIBELS

Lately Published

In Prejudice to the MEMORY of that UNFORTUNATE PRINCE;

Particularly to

I. A Letter to a Clergyman, relating to his Sermon on the 30th of January: Being a complete Anfwer to all the Sermons that ever have been, or ever shall be, preached in the like Strain on that Anniversary.

H. An Enquiry into the Share which King Charles I. had in the Transactions of the Earl of Glamorgan, &c. Wherein the Conjectures and main Positions of that Writer are shewn to be false, groundless, and by no Means reconcileable with the Character of a Critic or a Scholar.

Pro Rege Sæpe ; pro Patria, pro prisca Fide, semper.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

LONDON,

Printed: And fold by J. RICHARDSON in Paternoster-row, and P. Davey and B. Law in Avemary-lane. MDCCLVIII. The CASE of the Royal Martin

OR, AM

AWER

OT

SOME LIBELS

Laudy Publified

In Frejudice to the Nigmonvol of that CHICRTUNAS PRINCE;

MVSEVM HRITAN NICVM

ting to his Sermon complete An-

devent to the control of the like Strain on that Audioverlary.

A noverlary.

M. An Enquare Translation of the Hard of Chamber of the Whiter are shown to be faile, ground 1979, and by to Means reconcileable with the Chamber of a Chamber of a Chamber of a Chamber of a Scholer.

Pio Rige Jules, one Patrice, pro prifed Fide, Junger, 3

IN TWO VOLUMES

1 .1 O.V.

LONDOM

Finged: And fold by J. RICHARDSON in Price weller-free, and P. Davey, and R. Law in Mr. mary-lane. MDCCEVIII.

PREFACE.

NE of the greatest Misfortunes, which can happen to a Man who thinks, is to have to do with a Complication of Ignorance, Conceit, and Bigotry. Writers, whose Opinion of themselves is disproportioned to their Abilities, are a Kind of privileged Per-They are not unlike illiterate Profligates in the moral World, feldom reclaimablefeldom within the Reach of Conviction. Their excessive Vanity and superficial Knowledge - their obstinate Attachment to a Party - their fixed Resolution to abide by the most absurd Notions and Tenets, in which they have been educated, make it almost impossible, that a literary Dispute should be attended with any great Credit, either to themselves, or to those who write against them. As Folly has no Credit to lose, little or none can be got by the most triumphant Victory over it. To expose it, is to make it confiderable; and the only thing which can justify a Reply to the many ignorant Libels upon our Constitution, is an honest Intention to prevent the mischievous Effects of them. That this was the principal Motive which induced the Author of the following

Papers to make them publick, may fairly be presumed from the Nature of the Subject, which at present, God knows, is too unpopular to give him the least Prospect of any secular Advantage.— However the Cause of an excellent Church, and an excellent Prince, who died a Martyr for it, is too good to need the

Aid of modern Encouragements.

That rational and refined Pleasure, which attends the unbiassed Advocates, the sincere Lovers of Truth, is an ample Reward for their Labours, and more than sufficient to counterbalance the Frowns of Power or Patronage. It enables them to look down with a cheerful Decency upon the weak Efforts of Ignorance and Bigotry, and utterly disappoints the dark, involved Resentment, the treacherous Smiles of

courteous unmeaning Grandeur.

How bles'd are those few peculiar Men, who dare appear in the Defence of true Religion, and endeavour, as far as in them lies, to correct the Mistakes of their Fellow-Creatures in Points which concern their focial Happiness. In this Case, they are evidently engaged in the very Province, for which the Human Capacity was partly defigned, and in some little Degree answer one of the great and beneficial Ends of their Being. What a gentle Tide of peaceful Serenity must flow in upon the Breasts of those, who are conscious of a Behaviour so agreeable to the Defigns of Providence! How happy at least must such Men be in Comparison of him, whose chief Preferment is perhaps the guilty Purchase

Purchase, or infamous Reward of Iniquity — of abused and misapplied Abilities — of a Conscience, either perjured or prostituted to the meanest Purposes.

Horum

Semper ego optarim pauperrimus esse ----

The Author of the Case of the ROYAL MARTYR confidered with Candour, is neither fo vain nor fo weak, as to fancy himself exempted from Mistakes, even whilst his well-meant Endeavours are employed in correcting those of This, however, he can truly fay, that he has never implicitly or wilfully adopted the Mistakes of Men of any Denomination whatfoever-that the affectionate Regard, which he professes for all Mankind, would never suffer him to think of prostituting his Pen to mercenary Purposes, or making it subservient to the mean, the unworthy Ends of a Partythat, in the following Animadversions, in relating and discussing those historical Facts, which come under his Notice, Truth has been his fole Aim; and if the Publick shall vouchfafe to peruse the Case of an injured Sovereign, with that Candour and Impartiality, with which the Author has confidered it, his present Hopes and Views will be fully answered. Neither the barmless Flings of illiterate Scurrility, nor the gentle Discouragements of ceremonious Greatness, will give him any great Pain, or divert him from what he believes and knows to be his Duty. In an Age, when the Cause of Truth

Truth and Virtue demands the Affistance of every the lowest Member of the Community, he cannot think it the least Presumption to look upon the modern Accomplishment of prudential Silence, as one of the clearest Proofs of

modern Degeneracy.

A small Pamphlet, intitled, A Letter to a Clergyman, relating to his Sermon, preached on the 30th of January, was, if I mistake not, published in 1746; and the Case of the ROYAL MARTYR confidered with Candour was writ and defigned for the Press in 1748. This Circumstance is mentioned with no other View. than to account for some Particulars, which otherwise may appear difficult to the Reader. The principal Reason, which had any Weight with the Author for not publishing his Answer fooner, was, that he had taken some Notice of

a Trifler, who deserved none.

The Conduct of the Royal Martyr ought undoubtedly to be treated in a Manner flrictly ferious. For this Reason, it was once thought adviseable to throw the following Letters into a different Form, and to omit every thing, which had the least Appearance of Raillery. However, the Author confidered, that any further Pains bestowed upon an implicit Retailer of the ludicrous Drollery — the arrant Falsehoods — the base Misrepresentations — the idle Tales of one of the most infamous Writers. that this or any Age hath produced, would be paying him a still further Compliment. He is in Hopes, therefore, the Reader will pardon

him,

him, that he hath suffered some Observations (not perfectly suited to the serious Nature of the Subject) to pass unaltered—that he hath trisled a little with one, who hath trisled with Truth, and appears to have been so egregiously ignorant

of the History of the last Century.

Another Pamphlet, intitled, An Esfay to-wards attaining a true Idea of King Charles the First, is a Performance of such an extraordinary Nature, that I could not well avoid making some Animadversions upon it, This Treatife is pretended to have been writ with a most benevolent and publick-spirited View to the Peace and Happiness of the Community; and I verily think, that there is not a Libel extant, which is so evidently calculated for Purposes the very Reverse. It is pretended to have been writ with a Defign to heal the unhappy Divisions, which subsist amongst us, and to rescue the Reign of King Charles I. from Misrepresentation. And how has this Writer executed his Defign? why, either by adding to, curtailing, misrepresenting, or disguising the most authentic Facts --- either by advancing Positions which are utterly false - or drawing false Conclusions from those that are admitted to be true-by transcribing numerous historical Passages which are nothing to his Purpose, and filling almost every Page of his Book with Infinuations or Reflections, which have an evident Tendency to misguide illiterate Readers - to revive and perpetuate old Animolities --- to inflame the Paffions of the Populace-to incourage and propagate Republican Principles, and transmit to Posterity a most horrid and odious Idea of the Character of a Prince, the most injured of any, that ever sat upon a Throne *.

* It would be almost impracticable to transcribe into a marginal Note, the several Passages necessary to support the Positions abovementioned; for which Reason, I shall beg leave to refer the Reader to the following Pages, where, I presume, he will be thorough satisfied, that I have not aggravated Matters—that every Particular, which I have laid to the Charge of the Essay-Writer, is evident from his own injudicious and consused Heap of Quotations. It is notorious, that some of his Quotations are Passages from Authors, which are only mentioned to be consuted, and are actually consuted by the very Authors, whom he quotes; and that every material Calumny, which he has transcribed into his Libel, in Prejudice to the Royal Martyr, has been answered over and over again by Writers, in such a Manner as can admit of no Reply.

As this is the Case, we may fairly presume, that this Writer must have laid down some Rules and Reasons for writing in the Manner he has done. Let us suppose then the following Rules and Reasons to be laid before him, and all his historical Collections to be made and modelled agreeable to the said Rules.

Rule 1. Never cease to revive old Calumnies and Objections against Establishments; against Men or Things that you do not like.

2. Never take the least Notice of any Answers which have

been given to such Objections, &c.

3. If some few Men, who read a good deal, may be able to discover your Design, the Inconveniency of the Discovery will be more than counterballanced, by the wonderful Effects which such Expedients must have upon those, who read but little.

4. Calumnies and Objections revived and repeated, must have their proper Weight, with those at least who seldom read any Books, but such as are recommended to them by their Teachers.

As these Rules and Reasons are perfectly consistent with the Method which the Essay-Writer has observed throughout his whole Libel upon the Royal Martyr, these, in all Probability, were the Rules, which he determined to observe in compiling his historical Collections. Now, I would appeal to the learned World, whether the Plan here supposed is not as well calculated to do Mischief, as a Plan formed upon the most detestable Prin-

But what exceeds every thing, this Essay-Writer, hath not scrupled to transfer the Guilt of the Crand Rebellion upon the Members of the Church of England. He has plainly infinuated that they, who were sincerely attached to the established Church, were the principal Instruments in overturning the Constitution. If there was any Fault, says he, in opposing the King's Measures, and taking up Arms against him, it must be imputed to the (Members of the) Church of England; for they were the first and deepest in the Quarrel*. In another Place he has these Words — The most furious Drivers in the Parliament were Men well attached to the Church \(\frac{1}{2}\).

Such barefaced Difingenuity — fuch abfurd Effrontery is furely not to be paralleled. By the same Reasoning, the most notorious Robbery may be imputed not to the Villain who committed it, but to the Person robbed, who was so imprudent as to venture abroad with Money sufficient to discharge bis necessary Expences.

In the Year 1640 there were few Members in either House, but thought Redress of Grievances necessary. Lord Clarendon, as to this Point, is clear and express. Several Members, who were no Enemies to the Establishment, were for redressing Grievances, but nothing

ciples of arrant Jesuitism; whether a Writer, who adheres to the Rules abovementioned, is not as likely to prejudice, to disguise, and misrepresent, historical and moral Truths, as the most artful and abandoned Disciple of St. Omers.

^{*} Esfay, p. 20. 1 Ibid. p. 13.

more. - There were others, who had very different Defigns-who were for Root and Branch -for an utter Subversion of the Constitution in Church and State. These restless and defigning Men, whenever the King made any Concessions, which seemed to satisfy the greater Part of the Parliament and the People, never failed to alarm them with fresh Fears and Iealousies. To this End the most infamous Lies and Calumnies, were daily and industriously propagated in Prejudice to his Majesty; and for Fear the Differences and Disputes between bim and the Parliament should subside, numerous little Artifices were employed to cherish and revive them, as will be fully shewn in the following Pages. By these, and such like Expedients, the Members who were inclinable to stop at Redress of Grievances, were at last induced to join the most determined Rebels, and concur in Measures, which afterwards gave fome of them no small Uneasiness. When they found by what Sort of Men and Means they had been betrayed—when they found that the Defign of their treacherous Leaders was to throw Things into Confusion, and utterly subvert the Government—when they found that the Expedients, which they had made use of for that Purpose, were chiefly Calumnies and Lies, they feem to have been extremely forry for engaging with Men of fuch desperate and abandoned Principles, and to have heartily repented of the imprudent Parts they had acted.

And what is the Use, which the Essay-Writer has made of this Piece of History? what is the Consequence, which he has drawn from it? Why, that these misguided Men, were the chief Persons to whom (if to any) we must impute the Guilt of the Grand Rebellion—that the most furious Drivers in the Parliament were Men well attached to the Church—that if there was any Fault in opposing the King's Measures, and taking up Arms against him, it must be imputed to the Church of England; for they were the first and deepest in the Quarrel.

(Effay, p. 13. 20.)

When I first read this and some other Parts of the Esfay-Writer's Performance, it appeared to be fuch a shameful Perversion and Violation of Truth-fuch a studied Abuse of our Hiftory fuch a deliberate Infult upon our Constitution in Church and State, that I had once some Thoughts of giving it a full and distinct Answer, and placing the feveral Artifices of the Author in a Point of View easy and obvious to the general Capacities of Readers. To mention the great Pains which this and some other Writers have lately taken to misrepresent the History of the last Century, and asperse the Character of the Royal Martyr, would be only to apprize the intelligent World of fomething which can scarce possibly have escaped their Notice. An Attempt therefore to lay open the mischievous Designs of such restless Men -Men who feem determined not to be easy in their present indulged Situation, I thought needed no great Apology. However, upon Enquiry, I found that the Advocates for the Party were not so formidable, as I first imagined. I found that the Essay-Writer's Performance was generally looked upon as a Heap of insolent Libel and Misrepresentation, vastly beneath the Notice of any but the unthinking Multitude, whom it is evidently and artfully contrived to alarm and mislead.

" Is it possible, says my Friend Crito, that " you can employ any Part of your Time in " animadverting upon a Libel, that is a Re-" proach to Truth—to common Sense and " common Honesty? Is it possible that such a " garbled Collection of Stuff can ever do any " great Harm amongst Men of Virtue and " Learning? Is it possible that such Men can " give any Credit to an Author, who, in the " very Entrance of his Work, has endeavour-" ed to impose upon his Readers by the most " unfair Representation of Men and Things-" of Histories and Characters *? Who has " made no Scruple, in his very Preface, to af-" fert the most arrant Falsehoods; who, in " spite of the clearest Confutation of the idle "Story, which was lately advanced in Preju-" dice to the Genuineness of Lord Clarendon's " History, has had the Affurance to revive the " Story, and to tell it with Circumstances, " which were never before told or heard of " by any Mortal living ? + Is it possible that any

See the following Introduction.

⁺ See Pages 4, 5, 6, 7, etc.

" Regard can be paid to a Writer, who in " the two first Sentences of his Book has given " his Readers a notorious Untruth and a paultry " Misrepresentation? who in the first Sentence " has entertained them with a Lie, that is con-" fronted by the most authentic Record *? and " who in the fecond has basely misrepresented " the Sense of the Author, that he quotes +? " No, Sir, depend upon it, fuch a Writer " can never do any great Harm amongst Men of Understanding and Integrity; and if Ig-" norance and Party-Prejudice may be incli-" nable to countenance his Performance, you " may be affured that the fullest and justest " Display of his Artifice and Difingenuity " would only make some People more eager to " read and admire it. The Remark of a learn-" ed Gentleman of Age and Experience to " whom you are no Stranger, may possibly de-" serve your Notice. There are a Set of Peo-" ple, fays he, in this Kingdom, who feem re-" solved to admit of no historical Facts - no " Truths but what are agreeable to their own

" Way of Thinking; and I question, whether any one Expedient what soever hath been more serviceable to convince them of their Mistakes,

than the Indiscretion and Disingenuity of

" their own Writers. Their Writers, by over-" acting their Parts; by misrepresenting and

" disguising what they KNOW TO BE TRUE,

" and by persisting to affert for Facts, what.

^{*} See the Introduction.

⁺ See the Introduction.

bave been often and incontestably disproved

what consequently they KNOW TO BE FALSE, have evidently betrayed the Weakness of their

" Cause, and made more Converts to Truth,

" than you are aware of."

This sensible and friendly Rebuke, I own, had an Instuence upon me, and I sully determined to have as little to do with such Writers as possible. However, in the following Pages, enough, I presume, has been said to satisfy the Reader, that the Observations of my Friend Crito are strictly just, and that the Essay-Writer has done neither Credit nor Service to the

Cause he espouses.

The Author of the Enquiry into the Share which K. CHARLES the First had in the Transactions of the EARL of GLAMORGAN, etc. if I am rightly informed, is a Person who has a Claim to Respect; a Person of Credit and Reputation in the learned World; and if he has adopted some Mistakes prejudicial to the Memory of the Royal Martyr, it is presumed by his Friends that they ought to be looked upon as such — that they ought to be looked upon as Mistakes, not as wilful Misrepresentations—not as Calumnies or Aspersions, 'till good Proof is brought, that they were intended for that ungenerous Purpose.

This Author's Reflection upon the Integrity (the chief and best Qualification of a good Historian) is worthy a Critic and a Scholar—it censures the paultry Misrepresentations, the studied Artifice of Writers, with a proper Se-

verity,

verity, and amounts to a virtual Promise, that no Offence will be taken at a free and sair Examination of his own Performance. I shall, with the utmost Readiness, says he, submit to the Force of Truth, which ought to be the chief Aim of every Writer; and the Want of the strictest Regard to it in an Historian, in particular, transforms him into the most criminal of

Impostors. (See Enquiry, p. 343.)

I am under no Apprehensions of disobliging an Author, who has favoured the Publick with fuch a voluntary and folemn Declaration of his inviolable Regard for Truth. Men of Reading and Abilities, of fubtle and refined Parts may value themselves upon being able to misreprefent and disguise the Records of past Ages - to impose upon the World Conjectures for Truths. and Forgeries for Facts; but I verily think with the Enquirer, that the Abilities of fuch Writers serve only to transform them into Impostors bigbly criminal and contemptible. Unprejudiced Readers, it is certain, will not only condemn, but despise such Writers; and the Cause of Truth and Virtue demands, that the Imputation of Art or Imposture should rest upon THE MAN, upon whomfoever it shall appear to be fixed.

In my Reply to the Author of the Enquiry, etc. it would be an unpardonable Piece of Ingratitude not to acknowledge the kind Affistance I received from the late learned Mr. Carte. He favoured me with a great many Letters upon the Subject, which contain several Particulars, too valuable to be concealed from the Public.

I have therefore carefully and faithfully intermixed them with my own Observations. The only thing which I have chose to suppress, is his Opinion of the Enquirer. Whether the Enquirer will thank me for it, I know not. It may possibly be a Disappointment to a Gentleman of his conjectural Abilities and difinterested Views, that he cannot avail himself of the Credit of being publickly taken Notice of, by a Person of Mr. Carte's Principles. But however this may be, it is certain that the Enquirer can never want a Proof, that true Learning and a political Capacity are Accomplishments of a very different Nature. Mr. Carte's great Learning and critical Skill in our History will always have its due Weight with Men of Sense and unprejudiced Minds; and as to his peculiar Notions of Government, they chiefly affected himself.

He feldom troubled his Friends with any thing of that Kind. During a Correspondence with him for many Years, I can truly say, that I could never have guessed at his political Principles by any one single Hint or Notice in all his Letters; and I own I look upon it as one of the happiest Incidents in my whole Life, that I had the Advantage of corresponding freely with an indefatigable Scholar, whose Knowledge of the History and Antiquities of our Country exceeded that of any one to whom I

had ever the Honour to be known.

I applied to him for his Opinion o ffeveral Points in the following Work. He was extremely kind and obliging in his Answers, and always

always expressed a ready Disposition to communicate fuch Notices to his Friends as might be of Service to Literature. He was generally clear and fatisfactory in his Refolution of Difficulties. He had a masterly Insight into the Records of the Nation, and his Method of unravelling the most artful Misrepresentations - the most disguised Facts, seemed to be rather a Matter of Diversion, than a Work of Labour. What a wonderful Faculty, fays he, have these conjectural Writers at supplying the Defects of bistorical Knowledge and historical Honesty. And indeed, what a deal of Pains might Mr. Carte have faved himself, had he set out upon the Plan of these literary Adventurers? How easily, upon this Plan, might he have raifed to himfelf numerous and powerful Friends? How eafily might he have got rid of a Life of Fatigue and Difficulties, and become the Object of Homage and Obeisance? By the Aid of a Project fo nearly refembling that of some ingenious Projectors in 1720*, so artfully calculated to cheat and impose upon the Public - to impeach the Credit of authentic Facts, and flatter the prevailing Notions of an enlightened Age, I think, it is not improbable, that we might have feen even Mr. Carte advanced to a popular Title, dubb'd with a venerable Degree, and at length stepping into his Chariot, and looking down with a fneering Contempt upon conscientious Fools and Bigots. But he, poor Man, had no Notion of fuch Projects, nor did he live, or * S. S. D.

diw

wish to enjoy the Honours or Advantages attending them. He was contented to leave behind him the Reputation of a Scholar, and a well-bred Man, which he certainly was. He was a laborious Student, well acquainted with Men and Books. He had for many Years been admitted to an Intimacy with Persons of the first Rank and Character for Learning at Home and Abroad: His Travels were made serviceable to the most useful Purposes. He had very clear Sentiments of the Difference between a polite Scholar and a fine finical Gentleman, who has learnt to fpeak French ill, to no other Purpose than to speak his native Tongue worse; to enervate the latter - to impair its Strength, by a ridiculous Affectation of mixing an Alloy of French Wire with true Sterling; by affecting to adopt upon all Occasions a French Gesture. - a French Pronunciation - an idle Chitchat French Phrase-a Je ne Sgay quoi - an en passant, and throwing it into his Discourse with as much Propriety as a Pun into an Epic: Poem, or a whimfical, gaudy, flaring, disproportioned Gothic Ornament into a Building of the Tuscan Order, elegantly plain, neat and strong.

The reputed Politeness of a People could never reconcile Mr. Carte to their Foibles, Follies, or Fopperies. The English Fool, who returned from abroad, improved in the Dress and Grimaces of the French Coxcomb, was his utter Aversion. The Business of this judicious Historian was to collect the Learning of distant Ages;

to acquaint himself with the Records of Nations which had any Connexion with England: to import what was truly valuable, and enrich his Countrymen with the Treasures of foreign Libraries.

In this Capacity he was a Credit to every one who had the Pleasure of his Acquaintance; and I esteem it my peculiar Happiness, that I have this Opportunity of paying a grateful Refpect to the Memory of a Man, who did Honour to Literature while he lived, and at his Death left a Monument of his Abilities behind him, which bids fair to outlive the Malice of Scotish Criticism, the noisy, the virulent Efforts of Ignorance and Prejudice, if not the Force of Time.

Eheu! Britannia! Quando ullum invenies parem? Multis ille quidem flebilis occidit; Nulli flebilior quam tibi, Britannia.

Econs (ec a sat to be selected to the money since socioned Counce? Survey for a separation the town of the property of the Control of

by the sector of the action of a Perstantial and oxidities the or with operation, the character too or following with a street of bull wind recovered them all the true wire in the line man maces, effected many law and obese not and the

to committe film of wishing the ordered of Nationa Shared Ray pajasano Cons but dolly d. The bar redshiely vises any solve stooms of Nis Countryance with the reserver of foreign

the this Capacity he was a Credit to every care who had the lighting of his Arrestments end I offenn it and predict Hamiltonie in the Election have this appointment of the as a granded Res -old bib only and allo your, Mark of field gion to Education while he in ad, and at his Delited established of the Abilities betild be the high which may take to cottive the Malice of Start & Orition the north, the virulent BE. for a of Ignorance and Provider, it not the Topos of Time.

But the state of t was a general Hierel Britannista. . Digrego to any seemies paren ? dentity the quarm flebility occidit; or World Jebruer duam tibe, Estannia. Property and the state of the s

the second secon a decided a la voice expension plant days. A

here have a series to the state of

re energiated and election for a factor

INTRODUCTION.

OME few Particulars which are thought to affect the Character of K. Charles I, may not improperly be taken notice of in this Place. They have no great Connection with any thing which will be confidered in the Case of the Royal Martyr, etc. and are mostly such as will require an Examination too long to be inserted in marginal Notes. These Particulars, therefore, I shall examine and dispatch, before I enter upon Enquiries, which more immediately relate to the Conduct of that unfortunate Prince.

In the foregoing Preface (p. 13.) it has been hinted, that the Author of the Essay towards attaining a true Idea, etc. has endeavoured to impose upon his Readers by the most unfair Representation of Men and Things - of Characters and Histories. As this is a Charge of a confiderable Nature, it ought to be clearly proved, which, I presume, will easily be done.

This Writer, in order to recommend his Essay to the unthinking Multitude, promises very great Things. He promises to call, as it were, a Council of the most celebrated Historians and Writers of those Times, i. e. of the Reign of K. Charles I, and to give his Readers the

b 3

Satisfac-

xxii INTRODUCTION.

Satisfaction of bearing them stand forth, and in their own Words pronouncing upon the Cafe. -And what does he here mean by their own Words? why, sometimes Paragraphs altered and perverted to a Sense, which the Historians never dreamt of; at other Times Passages, which were inferted in their Histories only to be confuted, and which are actually confuted by the very Authors, from whom they are taken. So that here this Writer shelters himself under as arrant a Piece of puritanical Jesuitism, as is to be met with. He could fafely fay, that Passages found in the Histories of Writers were their own Words; and yet, at the same time, it is very clear, that, in the Cases abovementioned, they are neither strictly nor properly their own Words or Sentiments.

After this pompous Declaration, he affumes to himself the Province of affishing his Readers to judge of that Degree of Credit, which is due to the Testimonies of the several Historians from whom he has made his Collection. To this End he proceeds to give a short Account of the chief of them. And how has he behaved in this Respect? Why, they who are against bim, are either florid, prolix, or partial Writers; and their Histories garbled and interpolated; and they who are for him, and of his Party, are all learned, pious, and impartial.

Neal, Bennet, and Pierfe, avowed Enemies to the Establishment—who were but of Yester-day—who lived and wrote near a Century since the Reign of King Charles, are all Men of

Satisface.

great

great Merit, Learning, and Integrity. They were, says the Essay-Writer, Divines of the Separation, Men of acknowledged Merit, of good Learning and Reputation. However, Mr. Neal's History, he tells us, is the only one of these, of which he has made any considerable Use; and of this he gives a very high Character. It has been received, says he, with great Esteem by the curious and ingenious of all Denominations. And yet, it is well known, that there is not a modern History extant to which so many and such just Exceptions have been taken; the Author having been convicted of more Blunders, Inconsistencies, Missepresentations, and Falsehoods, than any historical Writer since the Reformation *.

Mr. Oldmixon's History would require a more than common Delicacy of Address to recommend it to the thinking World: Accordingly the Essay-Writer has intimated, that he was a little too warm and sanguine—but otherwise a very worthy, well-meaning, good Man. He was, says he, a Member of the established Church, and a hearty Well-wisher to it; and his History I consider as a good Collection of Facts, and of good Use to correct the Errors, and supply the Defects, of other Historians, particularly Clarendon's and Echard's.

This is such an extraordinary Account, as will require some little Animadversion. Mr.

10011

^{*} See Dr. Grey's Examination of Mr. Neal's History of the Puritans, and the late Dean of Wells's Vindication of the Church of England,

Oldmixon lived many Years in Bridgwater, as Collector of that Port, and several of the Inhabitants, of an unblemished Character, are very positive, that if he was a Member of the Established Church, and a Well-wisher to it, the chief Proof he ever gave of his Affection for it, was by feldom frequenting it - by paying just as much Regard to it, as is usually paid by Libertines and Deifts. He was always looked upon as a Person who sat extremely loose to Religion, it being notorious, that he was remarkable for ridiculing it, and despising those primitive Ordinances, which are observed in the Church of England; that he seldom was feen within a Church-door, unless to do what be openly disapproved of-unless to qualify himfelf for holding his Office, or else to hear an Affize Sermon, with a View to gratify his ludicrous Curiofity, and, like the Devil in Milton, with a ghaftly Smile to fneer at the Doctrines of his Redeemer, under a Pretence, that the Preacher did not teach them agreeable to his loose, illiterate, licentious, and indefensible Notions of Christianity.

And with respect to his Character as an Historian, the learned Reader need not to be told, that this was the Writer who was publickly convicted of the basest Falsehoods and Defamations, in relation to the Genuineness of

Lord Clarendon's History *.

He was so open and professed a Profligate, that he did not scruple sometimes to intimate,

^{*} See the following Pages, 4, 5, 6, 7, etc.

that he had as much to fay on the other Side of the Question, and would certainly publish another Kind of History, unless due Encouragement was given to what he was then writing. This is attested by several Persons of undoubted Credit and Reputation, now living in Bridgwater, from whom I received the Account.

It is with the utmost Reluctance that I am forced to fay any thing more of a Man, who is not able to answer for himself, and whose Memory is furely contemptible enough already. But when we consider the infamous Pains which have lately been taken to recommend his voluminous Libel to the World; and the great Mischief it has done amongst weak People, I think it a Duty incumbent upon me to endeavour to undeceive the Public, and prevent,

if possible, any further Mischief.

Oldmixon was fo indifcreet and ludicrous a Companion in his Conversation, that when a Gentleman once charged him with publishing the most notorious Falsehoods—Falsehoods which he (Oldmixon) knew to be fuch when he observed to him, that a strict Regard to Truth was a moral Duty—that a wilful Deviation from it was a Breach of common Honesty - when he was pressed hard in this Manner, he actually sneered at the Gentleman, and was surprized, he faid, to find him such a Stranger to the World. The World, fays he, is chiefly made up of two Sorts of People; of Fools and Rogues; and be who scruples to serve a Cause at the Expence of a few circumstantial Niceties

Niceties in Point of Truth, deserves to suffer the Consequences of his Folly and Bigotry.

The Gentleman is now living, and ready to declare, in the most solemn Manner, that he heard Words to the above Purpose from the Mouth of the celebrated Mr. Oldmixon. And yet this is the Wretch, who is represented by the Essay-Writer as a Member of the Church of England, as a bearty Well-wisher to it, and a good Collector of historical Facts, proper to supply the Defects and correct the Errors of Clarendon and Echard.

Next to the famous Mr. Oldmixon, Mr. Tindal is mentioned; of whom I shall say but little. I verily think it is no great Credit to that Gentleman to be named in such Company, or applauded by such a Writer; as, I presume, will fully appear in the following Pages.

Rapin is represented as a most indefatigable and impartial Writer, sull as eminent as the great Mr. Neal. Mr. Neal's History, it seems, bas been received by the curious and ingenious of all Denominations, and Mr. Rapin's is held in high Esteem both by Natives and Foreigners. — And yet it is certain that this last Performance has undergone the very same Fate with Mr. Neal's. It has been corrected in many Instances by its ingenious Translator; and numerous Faults —— numerous Misrepresentations and Falsehoods, have been laid to the Author's Charge, and clearly proved upon him *. And yet the Essay-Writer will have it, that as RAPIN

271211211/1

INTRODUCTION. xxvii

had no Connexion with any of our Parties, he was the better qualified to justain the Character

of an impartial Umpire betwixt them.

I would not willingly detract from, or depreciate, any Merit, to which this Writer has the least Shadow of Pretensions: let him, for once, therefore, remain in possession of this Part of his Character, and let the Observations in the following Papers determine, whether upon the whole, this favourite Historian of the Essay-Writer has said a great deal to his Purpose.

Archdeacon Echard could expect no great Compliments from a Man of the Essay-Writer's Principles, several material Truths being found in his History, which can never be made to coincide with the Design of the Essay, or its Author. The Character of this Historian therefore is drawn accordingly. Tho' his Integrity was never yet justly impeached, or so much as questioned, yet the Essay-Writer has represented him as an Historian of no great Credit or Reputation;—florid and prolix; not celebrated for bis Impartiality, a Dignitary of the Church, very warmly attached to it; a passionate Admirer of, and a zealous Advocate for, King Charles.

Bishop Burnet, on the other hand (if we may believe our Critic) has every Qualification which usually constitutes the Character of a good Man and a good Historian. He was a most faithful and bright Ornament of the Established Church—He was admitted into great Intimacy, for a long Course of Years, with many of the prime Managers of those Times, and had singular

xxviii INTRODUCTION.

fingular Opportunities for penetrating far into their secret Councils and Designs. He wrote an History of his own Time; and with an Appeal to the God of Truth, professes to tell the Truth, as fully and freely as he was able to find it out. From whence we must conclude, that this Prelate was all Truth and Probity—— that he never wrote or told a wilful Lie in all his Lifetime—— Mr. Salmon, and some others, will fully satisfy the Reader, as to this Point.

Coke has done no great Harm of one Side or the other; for which Reason his Character shall stand unmolested; and, provided the Essay-Writer quotes him fairly, he is at Liberty to make what Use of him he

pleases.

The Account which is given of Whitlock and his Memoirs is too remarkable, to pass unobserved. Whitlock, says the Esfay-Writer, was a Member of the long Parliament, one of the Commissioners at the Oxford and Uxbridge Treaties, a Man of great Knowledge, as well as Temper and Moderation, and of chief Influence in some of the principal Transactions of those Times. Lord Clarendon says of him, that from the Beginning he concurred in Measures with the chief Actors against the King .- How then, it may be asked, can this Writer be supposed to do Justice to the King, or to relate Things impartially? very eafily; the Esfay-Writer makes no Difficulty of it at all; for tho' Whitlock acted fuch a Part, yet Lord Clarendon tells us, that he had no Inclination to

INTRODUCTION. xxix

the Persons or Principles of those who opposed the King; and having no Inclination either to their Persons or Principles, we may depend upon his Accounts, says the Essay-Writer, as not

partial towards them.

I will have no Dispute with this Gentleman concerning the real Worth of Whitlock's Memoirs. That is not the Question. I verily think they are as good an Account of Occurrences, as could be expected from a Person so deeply engaged in the Opposition made to the King. The present Question is, whether the Reason assigned by the Essay-Writer is really a Reason for Whitlock's Integrity; or, rather, whether it has not something in it very much like jesuitical Imposition upon the unthinking Multitude.

The Words of Lord Clarendon to this Purpose are these: " Hollis, who was the frankest amongst them in owning his Animosity and " Indignation against all the Independent Par-" ty, and was no otherwise affected to the Presbyterians than as they constituted a Party, upon which he depended to oppose the other, " did foresee that many of those, who appeared most resolute to concur with him, would w by Degrees fall from him, purely for Want of Courage, in which he abounded. Whit-" lock, who from the Beginning had concurred with them without any Inclinations to their Persons or their Principles, had the same Reaof fon still not to separate from them. All his " Estate was in their Quarters, and he had a " Nature

XXX INTRODUCTION.

"Nature that could not bear, or submit to be

" undone. Though to his Friends, who were

"Commissioners for the King, he used his old "Openness, and professed his Detestation of all

" the Proceedings of his Party, yet he could

" not leave them."

Here it is observable, that the noble Historian ascribes the Behaviour of Whitlock to Want of Courage. He says expressly, that he had no Inclinations to the Persons or Principles of his Party, and that he prosessed his Detestation of all their Proceedings, and yet could not leave them; that the Reason which made Hollis foresee, that his Party would desert him, was the Reason why Whitlock could not separate from his; (viz.) that he wanted Courage; for that all his Estate was in their Quarters, and he had a Nature that could not bear or submit to be undone.

And what is the Use which the Essay-Writer has made of this Piece of History? why, that Whitlock, baving no Inclination either to the Persons or Principles of his Party, we may depend upon his Accounts as not partial towards them.

But if he had no Inclination to the Persons or Principles of his Party, had he no Regard for his own Character and Reputation? Tho he did not like his Party, yet he acted — at least concurred with — them in Measures from the Beginning; and can we suppose, that he would readily record any thing in his Memoirs, which restected upon his own Conduct?

If, as Lord Clarendon has intimated, he really difliked and detested the Principles and Proceedings of the Party, with which he embarked, he ought not to have acted with them; his acting with Men whose Proceedings he disapproved of, feems rather to impeach his Integrity, than to be any Kind of Proof of it; every Act which he did in Conjunction with them, being a manifest Violation of his Conscience, and contrary to Conviction. And is this a Sign of his Integrity? Is this a Reason, that we may depend upon his Accounts, as not partial towards them? Base Infinuation! and evidently defigned to impose upon and mislead illiterate Readers.

The Character which is given of Lord Clarendon and his History, is equally destitute of Truth and Ingenuity, it being chiefly Mifrepresentation, and in many Instances the very Reverse of what the Essay-Writer must know to be true. The Materials which that noble Historian received from the King, and which qualified him to give the most just and exact Account of several Facts, are pleaded to his Difadvantage, and urged as a Reason, that he was a partial Writer. That which usually gives Credit and Authority to other Historians, is infinuated to be a Fault in Lord Clarendon; at least a Circumstance sufficient to impeach his Integrity.

The King being informed that the Chancellor of the Exchequer intended to write a History of the Rebellion, fept a very gracious and kind

Letter

xxxii INTRODUCTION.

Letter to him at Jersey; " wherein he thank-" ed him for undertaking the Work he was " upon, and told him, he should expect speedily " to receive some Contribution from bim to-" wards it; and within a very short Time af-" terwards, he fent to him his own Memo-" rials (or those which by his Command had been kept, and were perused and corrected by " himself) of all that had passed from the " Time he had left his Majesty at Oxford, " when he waited upon the Prince into the " West, to the very Day that the King left " Oxford to go to the Scots; out of which " Memorials the most important Passages in " the Year 1644 and 1645 are faithfully col-" lefted *"

Here we find our noble Historian for some Time absent from the Scene of Affairs. During this Interval, he is furnished with such an authentic Account of Occurrences, as helped him to compleat his Defign, and relate some few Particulars with great Exactness. And indeed his Station in Life gave him uncommon Advantages, which he improved to the best Purposes, he being too honest a Man to make an ill Use of them. " I am too far embarked," " fays he, and have proceeded with too much " Simplicity and Sincerity with Reference to " Things and Perfons, and in the Examina-" tion of the Grounds and Overfights of Councils, to be now frighted with the Prospect of those Materials, which must be compre-

INTRODUCTION. xxxiii

" hended within the Relation of this Year's " Transactions, (viz.) 1645. I know myself " to be very free from any of those Passions, which naturally transport Men with Prejudice towards the Persons whom they are o-" bliged to mention, and whose Actions they " are at liberty to censure. There is not a Man, " who acted the worst Part in this ensuing "Year, with whom I had ever the least Dif-" ference, or personal Unkindness, or from " whom I did not receive all Invitations of " farther Endearments. There were many " who were not free from very great Faults " and Overfights in the Councils of this Year, " with whom I had great Friendship, which "I did not discontinue upon those unhappy " Overfights; nor did flatter them, when they " were past, by excusing what they had done. " I knew most of the Things myself, which I " mention, and therefore can answer for the. " Truth of them; and other most important " Particulars, which were transacted in Places " very distant from me, were transmitted to " me by the King's immediate Direction and "Order, even after he was in the Hands and " Power of the Enemy, out of his own Me-" morials and Journals. And as he was al-" ways fevere to himfelf, by cenfuring his own "Overfights, fo he could not but well foresee, " that many of the Misfortunes of this ensuing "Year would reflect upon some Want of Re-" folution in himself, as well as upon the gross " Errors and Overfights, to call them no " worfe,

xxxiv INTRODUCTION.

" worse, of those who were trusted by him.

" Wherefore, as I first undertook this difficult

" Work with his Approbation, and by his En-

" couragement, and for his Vindication, fo I

" enter upon this Part of it, principally, that the

" World may see, how difficult it was for a

" Prince, fo unworthily reduced to those

" Streights his Majesty was in, to find Minis-

" ters and Instruments, equal to the great

"Work that was to be done; and how un-

" likely it was for him to have better Success

" under their Conduct, whom it was then very

" proper for him to trust with it."

And what is the Use which the Essay-Writer has made of these historical Passages? Why, that Lord Clarendon was a very partial Writer—for that the King assisted him with some historical Materials—that his History was writ by the King's Approbation, by his Encouragement, and for his VINDICATION; that this being the professed Design, and these the Sources of his History, his Lordship, to be sure, sets the Actions of the King, and the Errors of his Government, in the most savourable Light, and puts the softest Constructions they could reasonably bear.

But why so? If a Writer undertakes to vindicate a Prince's Character from unjust Asper-sions, does it follow from hence, that he may not give a very just and impartial Account of his Behaviour? Does it appear that Lord Clarendon has been guilty of any considerable Mistakes throughout his whole History? or is it pretend-

INTRODUCTION. XXXV

ed, that a Charge of Partiality was ever clearly proved upon him? No; and it is equally certain. that his Reputation for Piety and Integrity will not allow us to suppose him guilty of such a Breach of focial Duty without evident Proof.

The noble Lord * who charged him with Misrepresentation in the Case of Sir Richard Grenvil, does him the Justice to say, that his greatest Enemies could never deny, but that he was a Man of strict Piety, Virtue, Knowledge, and supereminent Talents: And I verily think, the Charge which that noble Lord has endeavoured to fix upon him, amounts, upon a fair Examination, to little or nothing material. What the learned Dr. Burton has observed upon the Point, is ingenious and satisfactory. To this Writer therefore I shall refer the Reader, and only trouble him with a Paffage too judicious to be omitted. "Actions, fayshe +.

variously circumstanced, may be considered in " different Lights, and are capable of being re-

" presented in a different Manner; and accord-

" ingly Lord Lanfdown might find Reason to ex-

" cuse, what Lord Clarendon might with Reason " blame. Lord Clarendon may have been, and

" certainly was mistaken in some Points; but to

" charge him with, or even suspect him of, wilful " Misrepresentations, is a groundless and in-

" jurious Outrage offered his acknowledged

" Character."

Lord Clarendon had a confiderable Share in

^{*} Lord Lanfdown.

⁺ Dr. Burton's Genuineness of Lord Clarendon's History.

XXXVI INTRODUCTION.

the Administration of Affairs during King Charles the First's Reign, and yet is far from palliating the Errors and Mismanagement of it. In his first Book, the Misconduct of some of the chief Officers of the Court, are animadverted upon in a particular Manner; and in the very Place which the Essay-Writer alludes to*, and where the King is represented as a Prince of admirable Piety and Virtue, of great Parts, of Knowledge and Judgment, the noble Historian has made no Scruple to intimate, that his Majesty, through a Dissidence of his own Understanding and Abilities, was sometimes liable to great Mistakes and Weaknesses.

" Lord Clarendon's Impartiality is such, that it carries its own Evidence with it; he hav-

" ing done the utmost Justice to the Characters

of the most factious and ambitious Men,

" and cenfured the Conduct of his best "Friends, whenever they deserved it. The

"Facts which he has related, are often such,

as he himself was an an Eye or Ear-witness

" of; or else such as were taken from the Jour-

" nals of both Houses of Parliament; as long,

therefore, as these public Records remain, all

" Attempts to lessen the Credit of this noble

" Historian, must be weak and contemptible."

" That there are some Mistakes and Omissions

" in his History is certain; but then it is as

" certain, that they are generally such as the

" most judicious and impartial Writer might

^{*} Clarendon's Hift. Vol. IV. Book ix. p. 627.

INTRODUCTION. xxxvii

" have been guilty of, and fuch as, by compar-

" ing him with the Memoirs and historical Col-

" lections, which were writ about the fame

" Time, may eafily be corrected +."

And what does the Essay-Writer say of this Historian? Why, that when we are reading his Accounts, we are to remember, they are Accounts (not of an impartial Historian) but of a zealous Advocate for the Royal Cause; and yet from these, says he, we see enough to consider the Reign of this unhappy Prince, as a most

grievous Tyranny and Oppression.

Whether there is any Reason for this last invidious Resection, will be seen in the following Pages. At present my Business is only to point at the disingenuous Pains, which the Essay-Writer has taken to depreciate the History of Lord Clarendon, under a Pretence of affisting his Readers to judge of the Credit, that is due to it. The chief of his Reasoning to this Purpose, will be comprehended in the following Positions.

Lord Clarendon was the King's Counfellor, and his most intimate Friend and Favourite, and therefore to be sure was a dishonest Man —

a partial Writer.

Lord Clarendon was furnished with some Materials for his History from the King's Memorials and Journals, and wrote it with a professed Intention to vindicate the King from those unjust Aspersions, with which his E-

[†] Boswell's Method of Study.

XXXVIII INTRODUCTION.

his Enemies had loaded him, and therefore cannot be supposed to have given us a just and faithful Account of his Actions and Government. He would to be sure, says the Essay-Writer, set the Actions of his Majesty, and the Errors of his Government, in the most favourable Light; i. e. he would, to be sure, do as some infamous Writers have since done—he would misrepresent and disguise Facts—tho' his very Enemies could never deny, but he was a Person of an unblemished Character—of strict Virtue, Piety, Honour, and Integrity.

Such Reasoning as this in any other Writer would be looked upon as illiterate Bigotry — as downright Nonsense and Impertinence; but in our Essay-Writer, it seems it is the most likely Method to come at the Knowledge of the Truth; to attain a true Idea of the Character of King

Charles I .

Some few Particulars which this Writer has advanced in Prejudice to the Genuineness of Lord Clarendon's History will be confidered in the ensuing Pages . There is one Passage which will deserve some little Notice in this Place.

As the original Manuscript of Clarendon hath never been produced to remove the Suspicion of Interpolation, but is kept under a Veil of impenetrable Secresy, there remains little Room to doubt of some unfair and dishonourable Dealing in the Case. (See Essay, Preface, etc.)

Preface to the Essay, + Page 5, 6, 7. What

INTRODUCTION. xxxix

What the Essay-Writer can mean by this Infinuation - an Infinuation utterly false and groundless, I know not. That all those Parts of the Manuscript Copy (of which there is or can be any Dispute) are still extant; that they have been produced, exposed to public View, and feen by feveral Persons of Distinction, is what can fcarce possibly have escaped the Knowledge of the Essay-Writer himself *. Oldmixon indeed has intimated, that two Persons well versed in Hand-writing were refused a Sight of the Manuscript Copy; and to this Circumstance, probably, the Estay-Writer may allude. Supposing this to be the Case, I shall trouble the Reader with two Letters, which were transmitted to me by a Clergyman in Somersetsbire, and which may throw some Light upon the Point in Question.

To the Reverend Mr

SIR,

" Have met with an obstinate Heretic, who will not be persuaded of the Au"thenticity of Clarendon's History; and tho'
"I have shewn him, what Dr. Burton says,
"yet he remembers, on the contrary, that
fome creditable Persons, who went to see
the Manuscript in Bartlet's Buildings, were
refused a Sight of it, and that an Advertise-

* See Pages 5, 6, 7, etc.

xl INTRODUCTION.

ment was published of this Repulse. I mention this, that your Friend the Merchant
may, if possible, say somewhat to that Circumstance. I own, I do not think the Perfons accused capable of being guilty of such
a Fraud. You might as soon charge them
with being House-breakers. I long for an
Opportunity of mentioning this Fact to the
S——, who is said to have been an Eyewitness of the Manuscript.

I am, SIR,

April 27, very much your obliged Friend, 1745.

and humble Servant.

W. P.

To Mr. P____.

SIR.

"HE Compass of a Letter, and the little Leisure I have upon my Hands, "will not permit to say a great deal to the "Gentleman, whom you are pleased to call an obstinate Heretic; otherwise I could possibly divert him and you too.

"I knew Oldmixon thoroughly well; and have got together such authentic Memoirs of his Life, as would make a few — a Difusible of St. Omer's — an Irishman — a N— blush to be an Advocate for him.

"Your Friend's Objection to the Genuine-"ness of Lord Clarendon's History, I commu-

" nicated to the Merchant, who was not a

" little pleased with it. He was really very

" entertaining upon the Occasion. I can com-

" pare this Objection, fays he, to nothing but foraped Horse-radish. It stings a little, but

" not enough to burt; and is too thin to have

" any Weight in the Scale of Evidence.

" The Gentleman, it seems, remembers,

" that two creditable Persons went to see the

" Manuscript in Bartlet's Buildings ____ that

they were refused a Sight of it, and that an

" Advertiscment was published to that Pur-

« pose.

"That Oldmixon himself (after he was a "Criminal-Convict —— after Gentlemen of

" the first Distinction had seen the Manuscript,

" and pronounced him to be guilty of the basest

"Calumny—after they had openly declared,

"that what he had published in Prejudice

" to the printed Copy, was an idle, groundless,

"infamous Tale) that Oldmixon, after this, published something like an Advertisement

" to the Purpose, which you mention, is true.

" But how does your Friend know, that his

"Advertisement was to be depended upon?

" how does he know, that they who were re-

now does he know, that they who were re-

" fused a Sight of the Manuscript, were credi-

" table Persons? He has only Oldmixon's Word

" for it, and it is the first Time, I believe, that

" ever a Criminal was admitted an Evidence

" in his own Caufe.

xlii INTRODUCTION.

" But supposing, for for once, that the Per-" fons, who were refused a Sight of the Ma-" nuscript, were Persons of Credit, was Mr. " Mr. Radcliffe, the Gentleman at Bartlet's " Buildings, obliged to believe them to be such. " without proper Credentials? or was he o-" bliged to shew the Manuscript to every one, " who pretended to be a Man of Credit? You " may as well tell me, that he was obliged to " have shewn it till this Time, and to every " Man of Credit in the Kingdom. " As the Original had been advertised to be " feen at Mr. Radcliffe's in Bartlet's Buildings, " Mr. Radeliffe was obliged in Honour to shew " it to Gentlemen of known Credit and real " Worth; and it is most certain, he readily did " fo. He shewed it to several Gentlemen of " the first Rank and Character in the Kingdom; " fome of whom were well acquainted with " Lord Clarendon's Hand-writing - had a good deal of his Writing in their Custody-" compared it with the Original, and declared " they were fully fatisfied, that Oldmixon's " Story was an infamous Calumny. Now, can " your Friend be so weak as to suppose, that " Mr. Radcliffe's refusing to shew the Manus-" cript to two obscure Persons, is sufficient to " invalidate such Evidence as this? to invali-" date the Testimony of several Gentlemen of Worth and Distinction, of known and un-" doubted Credit and Integrity? Jack Straw " may with as good Reason deny that there

" are any Monuments in Harry the Seventh's

" Chapel,

"Chapel, because he is not always permitted to see them.

" Oldmixon, when he published the above " Advertisement, was drove to his last Shifts, " and had not a material Syllable to fay in his " Defence. He would fometimes endeavour to evade the Charge, and shift it off upon " Ducket or Smith, etc. At other Times he " appeared hardened against Conviction, wrote " and floundered on (as the Poet observes) in " mere Despair. At length, disappointed, an-" gry, ridiculed, and laughed at by fome -" despised and held in the utmost Contempt by " others - by those who before had shewn " him fome little Countenance — in this " wretched, contemptible Situation, he gave " out that two Persons, well versed in Hand-" writing, etc. were refused a Sight of the O-" riginal of Clarendon; for which Reason, " fays he, I shall be at no more Pains about it. " ____ A prudent Resolution undoubtedly! it " being certain, that had he and his Friends " feen the Manuscript, they would have feen, " what they did not like to fee. The Sight of " a Gibbet only serves to shew some People " what they are; and I think fuch People are extremely prudent, who refolve not to be " brought within the Sight of it at all.

I am, SIR,

April, 1754.

you very humble Servant, etc."

The Purport of what the Essay-Writer has faid of his celebrated Historians, is here fairly laid before the Reader; and the Use he has made of them, I verily think, is not to be paralleled. Having given us the above Account of the feveral Authors, who are to speak to the Character and Conduct of King Charles, he leaves his Readers to judge of the Credit that is due to them ; i. e. he first tells us, that one Set of his Historians are Writers of Credit, of Learning, and Reputation, and that the other are Men of little or none of neither Probity nor Abilities; and then leaves us to judge of what they fay, as our own Discernment shall direct; or, in other Words, he first affures us, that two or three of his celebrated Historians, who have affirmed, that King Charles was a Prince of great Virtue and Piety, deserve no Credit - are not to be depended upon; and then, like a most grave, wife, and impartial Judge, leaves us to believe, Whom? Why, those, to be fure, who are fit to be believed; not those who are Men of no Credit or Integrity. A Writer, whose Cause could possibly have admitted of any other Defence, would never furely have descended to such low mean Arts fuch barefaced Difingenuity - fuch shocking Infults upon the common Sense of Mankind. But to proceed. The very first Paragraph in this famous Essay (taken from Mr. Neale) as far as it relates to the Baptism of King Charles, is as arrant a Falsehood as ever was published. King Charles I, says he, was born

born at Dumfermling in Scotland, Anno 1600, and baptized by a Presbyterian Minister of that

Country *.

As the Record relating to the Prince's Baptism may not be unacceptable, at least to those Readers, who have not seen it, I shall give it them at large, and refer them for surther Satisfaction to Mr. Cantrell's Treatise, intituled, The Royal Martyr a true Christian.

In this Treatise it is proved, from the clearest and fullest Evidence, which can be desired in a Case so remote from the present Age, that Prince Charles was baptized by a Minister episcopally ordained. To this End, the learned Author has shewn, from several undeniable Circumstances.

1. That it was highly improbable at least, that King James should apply to the Presbyterian Faction to perform that Office, for any

of his Children; it being certain,

That at the Time when Prince Henry was born (in 1594) the Presbyterian Ministers were in Rebellion against the King, and affished Bothwell.

That at the Birth of the Princes's Elizabeth, they espoused the Cause of one Blake in Oppo-

fition to the King.

That Margaret, another Daughter, who was born some Time afterwards, was baptized (as Archbishop Spotswood expressly tells us) by Mr. David Lindesay, a Convert from the Church of Rome—a Priest, and of Consequence episcopally ordained.

That when Prince Charles was born, viz. in 1600, they (the Presbyterians) were in great Difgrace, and several of their Ministers ordered to remove from Edinburgh; they having behaved with great Insolence and Disloyalty. and disobliged the King in a particular Manner.

That all the Concessions which the King made in Favour of Presbytery, were forced from, and absolutely disagreeable to, his own Way of Thinking.

That the Acts which mere passed in 1586, and 1502, were the Refult of Necessity, and owing to the Distractions and Troubles in

which his Majesty was then involved.

That no fooner was he forced to pass the Act in 1502, but he declared his Dislike of it in the strongest Terms. He did fore forethink (lays Spotswood) the passing of that Act, calling it a vile Act: He declared further,

That he would get it repealed if possible; that if he could not do it, he would recommend it to his Son to do it; and that he actually

did fo in his Baoilinov Dwpov.

That from this Time he entertained Thoughts of restoring the ancient and true Government

of the Church by Bishops:

That in 1506 he pressed to have the Abuses crept into the Presbyterian Discipline, reformed; that a Reformation was accordingly made amongst the factious Ministers, and those, who were more peaceable, were placed in their Room:

That in the Year 1598, he was very earnest, that the Clergy should be restored to their Seats in Parliament:

That in the same Year an Act was passed, that such Ministers as his Majesty should please to provide to the Place, Title, and Dignity of a Bishop, etc. shall have a Voice in Parliament; and that the Bishopricks, then in his Majesty's Hands, or which should happen to fall void thereaster, should be only disposed to actual Preachers, and Ministers in the Church.

That the Business of the Bishops Voice in Parliament was determined and ratified in an Assembly, where the King was present at Montrose, March 28, 1600, about nine Months

before the Baptism of King Charles.

That pursuant to this Act, several Persons were nominated to the vacant Bishopricks; and that amongst those, was presented to the vacant See of Rosse, Mr. David Lindesay, the very Person who baptized King Charles, as will appear immediately.

From the foregoing Observations, I think it is very clear, that it could not be agreeable to King James to have his Children baptized by

Presbyterians; and it is equally clear,

2. That he was under no Necessity of doing a thing, to which he had such a Dislike; it

being certain,

That Episcopacy was the ecclesiastical Government in Scotland before and long after the Reformation:

That

xlviii INTRODUCTION.

That during the Innovation of Presbytery, there was a constant Succession of Bishops even

to the Time of King James the First;

That consequently, his Majesty could not want Bishops, or Persons episcopally ordained, to perform the Office of Baptism for his Children, even during the Innovation of Presbytery; and.

That in the Years 1598 and 1600, Episcopacy was again restored, and several Persons, as was observed before, were nominated to the Bishopricks then vacant. But this is not all. It is not only very improbable, that the Children of King James should be baptized by the Presbyterian Teachers; but,

3. Very certain that they were not. We are affured, that all his Children were baptized by Bishops, or Persons episcopally ordained.

"When Prince Henry's Baptism was solem-"nized, we are expressly told by Archbishop

- " Spotswood, that he was presented by the Eninglish Ambassador, the Earl of Sussex, in the
- Presence of the Embassadors of Denmark,
- " Mecklenburg, etc. to Mr. David Cunningham,
- " Bishop of Aberdeen, who was appointed to

" administer the Sacrament.

- "When the Princes's Elizabeth was bapti-
- " zed, the Magistrates of Edinburgh were Wit-
- " nesses; and the English Ambassador named

" her after the Queen his Mistress.

- " Another Daughter was baptized by Mr.
- " David Lindefay; and the Earl of Montroffe,
- "Lord Hamilton, etc. were Witnesses." (See Cantrell, p. 42. and Spotswood, p. 407. 424,425.)

The

The Record relating to Prince Charles's Baptism is very remarkable, but too long to be transcribed into this Place: I shall therefore give it the Reader at the End of these introductory Remarks. The Substance of it, as far as it relates to the Point in Debate, is as follows:

" Prince Charles was born at the Palace of Dumfermling in the Kingdom of Scotland,

" on the 19th Day of November, 1600. He

" was baptized by Mr. David Lindesay, Bi-

" shop of Ross, and Minister of Leith, upon

"the 23d Day of December following. His Gossips or Sureties were two French Noble-

" men, Monsieur de Rohan of Bretagne, and

" his Brother Monsieur de Soubise, and the La-

" dy Marchioness of Huntley. She bare the

" Bairn, (i. e. Child) in the Place of Nur-

" rine (i. e. Nurse) within the Pall at the

"Time of Sermon, which was preached on

" this folemn Occasion, by the said Bishop Lin-

" defay, from these Words of St. Paul's Epistle

" to the Romans, chap. xiii. ver. 11. And that

" knowing the Time, that now it is high Time

" to awake out of Sleep; for now is our Salva-

" tion nearer, than when we believed."

After all this, what must we think of the many Writers, particularly of the celebrated Mr. Neale—of the Essay-Writer, and that illiterate Plagiary at South Petherton in Somerset-shire, who have all considently afferted, that King Charles was baptized by a Presbyterian Minister?

The

The South Petherton Gentleman is such an unparalleled Piece of Hibernian Effrontery, that I am perfectly ashamed to take the least public notice of him. The Letter, in which he has advanced the above Calumny, and which is directed to one Mr. C-ft-m-n, is nothing more (some few idle, abusive, Scotish, deistical Compliments excepted) than an old Pamphlet, which was published many Years ago by a Diffenter in Exeter, and about the same Time answered and confuted in the clearest Manner; nor can I learn, that any one ever thought proper to make the least Reply to the Person who answered it. But this Northern Mirror of Modesty is so far from intimating that the Pamphlet received an Answer, that he has actually put it out as a new Thing, and as his own, What a String of Writers are here, nodding and dreaming on in the same mistaken Track! How like a Train of wild Ducks marching into a Decoy, and following one another, till they are fairly caught! In most Cases of this Kind, some old Jesuitical Decoy-Duck generally leads the Way, and whatever becomes of bim, his Followers feldom fail to meet a Fate fuited to the Merits of uninformed Credulity. Facile credimus, quæ volumus, is a Maxim which I verily think is no where so clearly illustrated, as in the Writings of illiterate, conceited Bigots.

The fecond Paragraph in the Essay-Writer's Performance, is a flagrant Misrepresentation of the Sense of Mr. Echard. (Essay, p. 1.) This Histo-

Historian speaking of King Charles, hath these Words: " In his younger Days he was subject " to several Infirmities, as to his Constitution, " which were accompanied with an APPEAR-" ING OBSTINACY IN HIS TEMPER;" i.e. there was fomething in his Behaviour, which looked like, or had the Appearance of, Obstinacy, but was not really fuch; it being certain, that what is here called an appearing Obstinacy, was nothing more than a Shyness or Uneasiness, which he (the Prince) discovered in Company, and which proceeded from his bodily Infirmities. That Mr. Echard meant nothing more than this, is clear from the very next Paragraph, which the Effay-Writer has thought proper to conceal. - For the Weakness of his (Prince Charles's) Body, fays Echard, at first inclining bim to private Recesses, and some Imperfections in his Speech caufing Discourses and Conversation to be tedious and unpleasant, be was suspected to be somewhat perverse in his Nature; but more Age and Strength qualifying him for manlike Exercises; and the public Hopes inviting him from his Retirements, he gradually freed the Nation from all such Apprehensions.

And how has the Effay-Writer represented these historical Passages? Why, the Expression (an appearing Obstinacy) was not strong enough for his Purpose. He therefore changes it into an apparent Obstinacy, and makes the Prince a Person of such notorious, obstinate Perverseness,

as was visible to all about him.

Another Paragraph in the same Chapter is altered in the same disingenuous Manner. Mr. Echard says, that he (the Prince) was chaste and temperate beyond Exception—clear from all known, personal Vices, and uninfected with those licentious Excesses, which are not only incident to that Age and Fortune, but in such Cases almost thought excusable, as Mr. May, and some

other Enemies acknowledge.

Here the Prince is said not only to be chaste and temperate, but to be clear from all known personal Vices: And this is the Character which is given him by every Historian of Credit who mention him. And how has the Essay-Writer transcribed this Passage? why, he has basely altered and disguised it; and, instead of saying, be was clear from all known personal Vices, makes Mr. Echard say, that he was clear from all known and personal Vices, of the sensual Kind; i. e. he was not a Rake, or a Debauchee. Can there be any Dependence upon a Writen, who is capable of such Disingenuity as this? And yet this is an Artifice, which he is notoriously guilty of, in several Parts of his Essay.

A Word or two, by Way of Illustration, will fet his Skill in this Respect in a clear Light.

A Painter, just as eminent for Drawing, as our Author is for Essay-writing; attempted to copy the Picture of one of the finest and most stately Horses in the Kingdom. A Connoisseur seeing the Copy, was highly diverted with it.

I profess, Sir, says he, it is vastly like. Like what, Sir, says the Painter? Like any thing you please,

please, says the Gentleman. I suppose you did not intend it, as a Resemblance of the Original? - No, Sir, fays the Painter, If I had, it would not have answered my Purpose. It is to be placed at a very great Height and exposed. I only intended, that it might not be mistaken for the Sign of an Ass or a Goat.

The authentic Records of past Ages are too valuable to be trifled with; a defigned Mifreprefentation of them is a Crime of a complicated Nature - Base in itself, and prejudicial in its

Consequences.

The Authors of fuch an iniquitous Practice are evidently a public Nusance; and ought to be dragged out of their Fastnesses, and baited and exposed no less than Wolves or Bears. And yet the Regard which is due to the learned Reader forbids me to entertain him with Animadversions of such a trifling Nature. The Pictures of Wolves and Bears are an Amusement fit only for Children, and the Margin of a Page is the only Place fit to be blotted with the Characters and Cruelties of fuch favage and mifchievous Creatures. To the Margin therefore I refer the Reader for fomething, which may possibly engage his Notice *.

I shall

^{*} It would be very easy to point out several Passages, which our Estay Writer has transcribed from Mr. Tindal and others; and endeavoured to make serviceable to his Design; but which are really as little to his Purpose as those which he has quoted from Mr. Echard: I shall only in this Place mention one Quotation, which is too flagrant an Instance of his Disingenuity to be overlooked.

I shall only beg the Reader's Patience a Moment, whilst I consider one Calumny, which is

He would fain make his Readers believe, that King Charles begun the War with the Parliament-that he was the first Aggreffor. Whether he was or not, is not the Question at present; that Point will be confidered hereafter. The Question is, whether Mr. Tindal's Words are any thing to the Effay-Writer's Purpose? or whether the Effay-Writer has not basely disguised the Sense of them, by an additional Comment of his own, utterly false and groundlefs. The Words of Mr. Tindal, as they are found in the Estay, are these: "It has been warmly disputed on which " Side the War first began, Whether the King or the Parliament " were the Aggressor? He that believes the King's Concessions were a fufficient Guard against any Invasions of the national " Liberties, and that his Majesty really intended for the future " to govern by Law, must condemn the Parliament for requir-" ing any farther Security, and deem the two Houses Authors " of the War. On the other hand, he that thinks the King " had unwillingly confented to the Acts limiting his Preroga-" tive, and would have revoked them, whenever it had been in his Power, must throw the Blame of the War upon the King, for not agreeing to a farther Limitation of his Preroga-

" tive, at least for a Time."

But how are these Words a Proof, that the King began the War? Or how can they possibly be made such? Very easily. Mr. Tindal indeed determines nothing on one Side or the other; he only thinks, that the King was blameable, upon Supposition his Intentions were infincere; but the Esfay-Writer in a Parenthesis easily supplies this Defect, and roundly asserts, that Lord Clarendon very strongly intimates, that the King's Intentions were not fincere.—That he did not intend to govern according to Law, but to revoke the Acts which limited his Prerogative. Lord Clarendon, says he, very strongly intimates this to have been bis Majesty's Intention. Horrid Falsehood! as may be seen clearly proved in the following Pages, 176, 177, etc. So that here we have Misrepresentation, or rather mere Supposition, imposed upon the Reader for Proof, and Lord Clarendon is charged with a notorious Untruth to give it a Sanction—to give Colour to an Imputation upon a murdered Sovereign, which has not the least Foundation to support it.

But this is not all. The Essay-Writer is not content to abuse his Readers with the most open and bare-faced Misrepresenta-

frequently

frequently urged in Prejudice to King Charles's Character, as a Martyr. It is confidently in-

tions, but, in order to palliate and difguise them, has had Recourse to an Artifice, which shews his Cause to be indefensible, and himself to be without Excuse.

When he first published his Performance, the partial and garbled Nature of it was too slagrant to escape the Notice of any one, who had the least Acquaintance with the History of the last Century. Several of his Readers complained of his Disingenuity, and soon observed, that the very first Sentence in his Treatise was a notorious Falshood, and the second a shameful Misrepresentation of the Sense of Mr. Echard. These, and other Instances of the like Kind, being generally observed and complained of, a Friend and Correspondent in Somersetsbire was at length told, that the Passages excepted to were only Errors of the Press; and accordingly the following Errata were sent him, printed on a little Scrap of Paper.

ERRATA.

Preface, Page 1, Line 24, for on read no. P. 1. 1. ult. for apparent, read appearing. P. 2, 1. 32, read (of the fenfual Kind) and P. 87, 1. 19, read (very justly and loudly) both included in Parentheses. P. 4. 1. 31, for Poltrons, read Poltron. P. 15, 1. 34, for to read by. P. 41, 1. 5, add William Stroud. P. 47, 1. 3, read with. P. 115, 1. 15, dele Rebels. P. 155. 1. 7. read these.

These, and these alone, were the Errata sent my Friend; and how does this mend the Matter? what Satisfaction is here made for these and numerous other mischievous Lies and Deceits, which were to be imposed upon the Public? Are even these sew Errata printed with the Book? No; nor can we suppose that the Author could have been guilty of such gross Misrepresentations by Accident. Can he be supposed to have wrote apparent for appearing, without some Design? Can he be supposed to have added four Words to a Sentence (viz. of the sensual Kind) through mere Mistake? and with what Design could he do this, unless to pervert the Sense of the Author whom he quotes, and missead his Readers?

But what, if possible, is still worse, he would now make the World believe, that these Misrepresentations, etc. were Errors of the Press; and for once let us suppose them to be such, how does this acquit him of the most shocking Injustice done to his Fellow-Creatures? Does he not hereby confess, that he is a most arrant something, which Decency forbids me to call by its proper Name? Does he not hereby acknowledge himself to be

infinuated, that he had no Title to the Denomination of a Martyr; and that the Members of our Church offer a very abfurd and superstitious Incense to his Memory, by commemorating him as such. This insolent and barbarous Calumny, considering the national Appointment for declaring our Abhorrence of the Murder of his Majesty, may at first Sight ap-

guilty of the basest Impositions upon the Public? Did he ever, at a proper Time, or in a proper Manner, take care to correct what he calls the Errors of the Press, or to prevent the Mischiess, which must naturally and necessarily be consequent upon a Publication of them? No; on the other hand, it is well known, that his Libel was published several Months before any Errata were probably thought of—at least, before they were sent abroad; and the same Libel is still lest to do all the Mischies, which was first intended, without any Errata annexed to it.

Never furely did a Writer take such Pains to expose himself and his Cause. Had his Cause been really defensible, or had he himself thought it so, can we conceive, that he would have called in such mean—such mischievous and detestable Aids to

defend and support it.

How inoffensive are the profligate Sneers of an Oldmixon, or, indeed, of any one who is an open and avowed Enemy to Truth?

— How harmless the illiterate Plagiarism of a C————de, in Comparison of the Art and Effrontery of such a (What shall I call him?) popish or puritanical Champion? a Champion compleatly equipped in a modern Suit of Protestant Armour, and exerting the utmost Skill and Abilities of the most dextrous Jesuiti-

cal Bigot.

The masked Traytor is certainly the most dangerous Foe to his King and Country. A known and professed Liar, like the first Murderer, has a Kind of Mark set upon him, and is easily guarded against. Such a Wretch, even when he speaks Truth, is seldom allowed any great Degree of Credit. The Force of this Observation is evident in most other Cases. The avowed Insidel is a generous Adversary, in Comparison of the pretended Believer. The one smiles, betrays, and secretly stabs—the other openly declares his Enmity to Religion, and puts us upon our Guard.

pear very furprifing; but will be less so, when we confider, from what Quarter it comes. It usually comes from Men, who are the Descendants of those that dethroned and murdered him - who, at least, are Advocates for the Grand Rebellion, and confequently have no other Method of palliating the Guilt of the horrid Fact, than by murdering his Majesty's Reputation, and making it as infamous and odious as possible. It is not unusual to observe fuch Men implicitly copying one from another the most groundless Lies and Calumnies, without taking any Notice of the Answers which have been given to them, without fo much as enquiring, whether there is the least Foundation for them. However, if the above Afpersion shall appear to be the Result of Ignorance or Prejudice, I think we may venture to conclude, that it is at least an unprecedented Infult upon an Establishment, which affords the kindest Protection and Indulgence to those who industriously promote and propagate it: I shall therefore, without farther Apology, confider how this Matter stands: I shall confider, whether there is the least Foundation for a Calumny fo injurious to the Memory of the Royal Martyr-fo infolent-fo shockingly rude and difrespectful to a Community of Christians, who, for near a Century, have declared, in a very public and folemn Manner; their Abhorrence of the Murder of a Prince, whom parliamentary, and other the most authentic Records.

cords, have transmitted to them, as a Prince of

firict Virtue and Piety.

Here then it is alledged, that King Charles was so far from being a Martyr for Episcopacy, that he actually gave it up; that he consented to the Abolition of it. The Grounds for this Aspersion shall be fairly laid before the Reader, and the Reader left to judge to what a Height of Insolence, ignorant and indulged Prejudice will carry some People.

July 11, 1646, Propositions were sent to the King at Newcastle from the Lords and Commons, assembled in Parliament. The third Proposition was, That a Bill be passed for the utter abolishing and taking away of all Archbishops,

Bishops, etc.

5,

In a general Answer to these Propositions, fent from Newcastle, dated August 1, 1646, the King desired to come to London in order to treat with the Parliament; and, after a Message sent to both Houses, dated at Newcastle, December 20, 1646, his Majesty's Answer to the said Propositions (dated from Holdenby, May 12, 1647) was as follows:

"In Answer to all the Propositions concerning Religion, his Majesty proposeth, that he

will confirm the Presbyterial Government,

" the Affembly of Divines at Westminster, and

" the Directory, for three Years, being the "Time fet down by the two Houses; so that

" his Majesty, and his Houshold be not hin-

" dered

dered from that Form of God's Service, which they had hitherto made use of."

Another Meffage with Propositions was fent to both Houses from his Majesty at Hampton-Court, dated November 17, 1647, purporting, that for the abolishing Archbishops, Bishops, etc. his Majesty clearly professeth, that he cannot give his Consent thereunto; both in relation as be is a Christian and a King; and then, after giving his Reasons in a particular Manner, he goes on - yet confidering the prefent great Distempers concerning Church-Discipline; and that the Presbyterian Government is now in Practice, his Majesty, to eschew Confusion as much as may be, and for the Satisfaction of his two Houses, is content, that the said Government be legally permitted to stand in the same Condition it now is, for three Years; provided that his Majesty, and those of his Judgment (or any other, who cannot in Conscience submit thereunto) be not obliged to comply with Presbyterian Government; but have free Practice of their own Profession, without receiving any Prejudice thereby; and that a free Consultation and Debate be had with the Divines at Westminster (twenty of his Majesty's Nomination being added to them) whereby it may be determined by his Majesty and the two Houses, how the Church-Government, after the faid Time, shall be fettled; (or sooner, if Differences may be agreed) as is most agreeable to the Word of God, with full Liberty to all those who shall differ

differ upon conscientious Grounds from that Settlement; provided that nothing be understood to tolerate the public Profession of Atheism, or Blasphemy, contrary to the Doctrine of the Apostles, Nicene and Athanasian Creeds.

In his Majesty's Propositions dated at Carifbrook, Sept. 29, 1648, are the following Concessions—His Majesty will consent, that the Calling and Sitting of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster be consisted for three Years by Act of Parliament; and will, by Act of Parliament, consistent for three Years the Directory in England, Ireland, and Wales, provided, that his Majesty and others be not obliged to comply with such Government or Form of Worship, but have free Practice of their own Profession, and that a free Consultation and Debate be had with the Divines at Westminster (twenty of his Majesty's Nomination being added to them) etc.

In the King's final Answer to the Divines at Newport concerning Episcopacy, dated November 1, 1648, at the Conclusion of the same, these Reasons are given:

" For certainly, until one of these Things can be clearly evidenced to his Majesty, (viz.)

either,

" That there is no certain Form of Church-

Sould the or work in the A

" Government at all prescribed in the Word of

" God; or, if there be,

" That

"That the Civil Power may change the fame, as they shall see Cause; or if it be un-

"That it was not episcopal, but some other; his Majesty thinks himself excusable, in the "Judgment of all reasonable Men, if he can-

" not as yet be induced to give his Affent to

" the utter Abolition of that Government of the Church, which he found here settled to

" his Hands — which hath continued all over the Christian World, from the Times of the

"Apostles, until the last Age, and in this Realm, ever fince the first Plantation of

" Christianity, as well fince the Reformation

" as before—which hath been confirmed by
" fo many Acts of Parliament, approved as

" confonant to the holy Word of God in the

"Articles of our Religion, and by all the Mi-"nisters of the Church of England, as well by

their personal Subscriptions, as otherwise so

" attested and declared—and which himself, in his Judgment and Conscience, hath for

of fo many Years been, and yet is perfuaded to

" be at least of apostolical Institution and

" Practice."

Here it is observable,

I. That in all the Concessions which the King made the Parliament, he never appears to have considered Presbyterial Government as consonant to the Word of God, but very different from the apostolical and primitive Government of the Church of Christ—very different

ferent from that of every Church upon Earth

for fifteen hundred Years together.

2. That accordingly he reserved a Liberty for himself and his Houshold, etc. to receive the Ordinances of Religion from the Hands of Ministers episcopally ordained, and to attend upon that Form of devotional Service, which had been the Service of the established Church.

3. That he only confented to Presbyterian Government for the Sake of Peace, and for the Satisfaction of his two Houses; and that only for three Years, and upon Condition the Affair should be fairly debated by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, and by others of his

own Appointment; and, may and find and it

absolutely insisted upon an utter Abolition of Episcopacy, he resused to consent to it. And how in the Name of Goodness can this his Majesty's Conduct be interpreted, as consenting to the Abolition of Episcopacy, or affect his Chau

racter, as a Martyr?

His Dominions at this Time were a Scene of the utmost Distraction— of Misery, Blood and Barbarity; and he himself was involved in the greatest Troubles and Calamities. In this Situation his Behaviour was truly Christian. He behaved like a Prince who had the Interest of Religion— the Honour of his God, and the Peace and Welfare of his People sincerely at Heart. He sat unmoved amidst the raging Waves of Affliction—amidst the most insolent Pro-

Provocations from cruel and unreasonable Men. He divested himself of Pride, Passion, and Resentment (the usual Attendants of provoked Majesty) and made the most generous and peaceable Concessions to those, who had treated him in a very undutiful and despiteful Manner.

His religious Principles were the Result of sober, serious, and rational Enquiry. Hence that hearty and zealous Affection, which he professed for the Government and Worship of the Church of England; an Affection pure and unmixed with the least illiterate Tincture of

implicit Faith or Obedience:

He was pious and fincere in his Profession, but neither ignorantly nor obstinately attached to any Tenets what soever. If he was wrong, he defired to be informed. He defired to have his Doubts cleared up, and his Conscience satisfied in those Points, in which, upon the Principles of his Adversaries, he had a Right to be satisfied. He defired, that the Matters in Dispute, might be debated publickly - that during this Interval, he and his Subjects, who were of the established Communion, might be allowed to ferve their God in such a Manner, as they believed to be right; and upon these Conditions, he admitted, that Presbyterian Government might stand as it then was for three Years; till at least it could be made appear, either, so co throng and controllers on a ready

That there was no certain Form of Church Government prescribed in Scripture; or, if there was.

That

lxiv INTRODUCTION.

That the Civil Government had a Power to change the same, as they should see Cause; or, if it appeared to be unchangeable,

That it was not episcopal, but some other.

And what was the Result of these his Majesty's Requests? why, no Conditions were to be granted him—no Regard was to be paid to the conscientious Scruples of him or his Adherents—no Synodal Debates were to be admitted; but he was to consent implicitly to what he believed to be wrong—He was to consent to the utter Abolition of Episcopacy, which he believed to be the apostolical Government of the Church, and which he had sworn

to maintain and support.

To this cruel and barbarous Usage, his Majesty shewed a pious and proper Resentment. Like a brave Prince, and a good Christian, he chose rather to undergo the Loss of his Crown and his Life, than confent to a Propofal for injurious to his Conscience —— so inconsistent with what he believed to be his Duty. And yet this is the Behaviour, for which he is now condemned which, at least, is now pleaded to his Difadvantage. His Concessions to the Parliament, which shewed him to have the highest Regard for Peace and Piety which demanded the most dutiful Submission from his Subjects, is now urged in Diminution of his Character, as a Martyr. So abfurd, so preposterous are the Calumnies of misguided Zeal of ignorant, and virulent Bigotry.

Had

Had his Majesty's Concessions been really culpable, yet I cannot fee, how they could poffibly affect his Character, as a Martyr. Is it required, that a Martyr should be faultless should be exempted from the Infirmities of Humanity_from Sin, from Imperfection and Error? If so, it is most certain, that King Charles was no Martyr, nor was there ever a Martyr upon the Face of the Earth, Upon this Suppofition, St. Peter himself, notwithstanding his Tears and Repentance, must be struck out of the List; and poor Archbishop Cranmer must have committed his subscribing Hand to the Flames to little or no Purpose. Both St. Peter, and the Protestant Archbishop, the one by subscribing to Popish Doctrines, and the other by denying our Saviour, must for ever have defeated their Title to the Honour of Martyrdom.

Any further Examination of such an absurd Charge, would be needless — would rather want an Excuse, than metit the Attention of the serious Reader. As the King was murdered above a Century ago, it only remains that I should offer a Word or two in Vindication of the solemn Manner, in which we still declare our Detestation of the horrid Fact. But as this Particular may be considered in the sollowing Pages, I shall say but little to it at present.

The Murder of King Charles, for half a Century, or more, was deemed the greatest Reproach to a Christian People, the most barba-

lxvi INTRODUCTION.

rous and detestable Crime, that ever was committed in a Christian Country; and accordingly, the Day was for some Time observed with great Marks of Piety and Devotion, by the Members of the established Church—by all but those, who, in Point of Principle, or Defcent, had any Connexion with the Men, who

committed the bloody Fact.

On the other hand, it is well known, that, in the present Age, great Pains have been taken, not only to represent our assembling on the 30th of January as needless and uncharitable, but to load the Memory of the Royal Martyr with such odious and criminal Imputations, as must transmit his Name, if possible, to suture Generations, with the utmost Insamy. Hence that impious and unthinking Indisference, which has lately been shewn towards declaring an Abhorrence of his Murder — towards paying the least Regard to the Day, which is set apart for that Purpose.

However, if he was a Prince of those Virtues and Accomplishments, which all Historians of Credit say he was, it was manifestly a very great Crime to murder him; and if it was a Crime to murder him, it will be no Difficulty to prove, that a public Detestation of the Fact is as necessary now, as a Century ago; that a Compliance with the modern Notions of difregarding the Anniversary of his Martyrdom, is, in Effect, approving of his Murder, and saying with the Fews, His Blood be upon us and

INTRODUCTION. lxvii

our Posterity. As to this Particular, therefore, I shall detain the Reader no longer, but refer him to the latter Part of the following Work, where he may possibly be apprised of the treacherous Designs of those Men, who are for laying aside the Observation of the Day; it being certain, that all Attempts to divert us from our Duty in this Respect, have an evident Tendency to involve us in the Guilt of the most deliberate Murder that ever was committed, since the Crucifixion of our Blessed Lord.

or you proposed to plan trader as a second

是一种类似的 克克斯 医克斯特氏

An

An Account of the

Birth and Baptism of King CHARLES I,

Copied from a Manuscript in the Lyons's Office at Edinburgh; written by John Blinsele, Ilay Herald, who assisted at the Baptism.

TPON Wednesday, betwixt eleven and twelve Hours at Even, the 19th Day of November, 1600, the Queen's Majesty was delivered within the Palace of Dumsermling of a Man-child. God of his Mercy make him his Servant; give him long and prosperous Days to live both to God's Glory, and to the Welfare of the Country.

Upon Tuesday the 23d of December 1600, the King's Majesty came from his Chamber to the Chapel-Royal, convoyed by their Noblemen, viz. the Marquis of Huntly, the Earls of Montrose, Chancellor, Cassils, Mar, and Winton, with sundry Lords, and other Noblemen, my Lord Lyon, Sir George Douglas of Ellon, Knight, who supplied the Place of William Shaw, Master of the Ceremonies, John Blinsele, Ilay Herald, James Borthwick, Rothsay Herald,

Herald, and Thomas Williamson, Ross Herald, Daniel Graham, Dingwal Pursevant, William Makison, Bute Pursevant, and David Gardner, Ormond Pursevant: our Coats of Arms displayed, Trumpets sounding before us, convoyed his Majesty to the Chapel-Royal. And there his Majesty was placed on the East Geivil of the Chapel. And thereafter my Lord Lyon, and Master of Ceremonies, Heralds, Pursevants, and Trumpets came to the Queen's Chamber, and there was a Pall of Gold, Silver, and Silk, very magnificent, wrought (as it was spoken) by his Majesty's Umq' Mother, of good Memory, which was fustained and borne by fix Knights, viz. the Knight of Edzell, the Knight of Diddup, at one End; the Knights of Trequair and Ormiston at the other End; and, in the Midst of the Pall, on every Side, the Knight of Black-Ormiston, called Sir Mark Ker of Ormiston, and William Balinden of Broughton, and within the Pall the Bairne, borne by Monsieur de Roban, a Nobleman of Brittany, who bare the Bairn in his Arms from the Chamber to the Chapel; and on every Side of the faid Monfieur de Roban, his Brother, called Monfieur de Soubife*, and, on the other Side of him, the Marquis of Huntley, and behind him my Lord Livingston, who bare up the Bairn's Robe Royal of purple Velvet, lined with Damask. The Bairn was covered with Cloth of Gold and

Lawn. And behind the Dames of Honour. the Marquis of Huntly's Wife, the Countess of Mar, with the Wives of my Lord-Treasurer, Prefident, Secretary, with many other Dames of Honour. And before the Pall was the Bairn's Honours borne; viz. my Lord President bare the Crown Ducal, my Lord Spynie bare the Layer and Towel, my Lord Roxburgh bare the Basin, my Lord Lyon, Master of Ceremonies, Heralds with our Coats displayed, Trumpets founding before us, with fundry other Noblemen: We ranked to the Chapel, till we became before his Majesty; and there, on the North Side of the faid Chapel, the Pall and Bairn was placed; the Lady Marchioness of Huntly bare the Bairn instead of the Nourrice, within the faid Pall all the Time of Sermon. On the East Side of the faid Pall was two Chairs of Cramoify Velvet, where the two Brothers fat beneath his Majesty, on his Majesty's Right-hand; and upon the West Side of the Pall sat these Noblemen, the Marquis of Huntly, Chancellor, Caffils, Mar, Winton, Treasurer, Secretary, Clerk Register, Advocate, and fundry other Noblemen of the fecret Council. Upon the South Side of the Chapel, my Lords Living ston, Spynie, Prefident Roxburgh, and fundry other Noblemen, and the Servants of the two Frenchmen, who were his Majesty's Gossips.

The Sermon and Baptism was made by Mr. David Lindsay, Bishop of Ross, and Minister of Leith, which was upon Romans xiii. 11.

The

The Time of the Sermon being ended, Mr. David Lindsay declared it over again in French, to the two Frenchmen, that were Gossips. And thereafter he proceeded to the Baptism of the Bairn. The Pall and Bairn was brought to the Pulpit, borne by the said Monsieur de Roban, and his Majesty came from his Place to the said Pulpit with the said Noblemen. And the Minister baptized him, naming him CHARLES.

- And then, after a Pfalm fung, and Bleffing faid, my Lord Lyon proclaimed his Styles, and called him, My Lord Charles of Scotland, Duke of Albany, Marquis of Ormond, Earl of Ross, Lord Ardmannogh; and thereafter Dingwal Pursevant, proclaimed his Styles out of the West Window of the said Chapel, crying with a loud Voice, Largess of the Right High and Excellent Prince, my Lord Charles of Scotland, Duke of Albany, Marquis of Ormond, Earl of Ross, Lord of Ardmannoch, Larges. Largess, Largess: And thereafter, John Blinfele, Ilay Herald, did cast out of the said Window, one hundred Marks of Silver to the Poor, of the Duke's Largess; Trumpets sounding, the Castle shot nine Cannons; his Majefty ranked from the Chapel to the Chamber, as he did before: The Pall, Bairn, and Honours were borne, the Lord's Dames ranked from the Chapel to the Queen's Chamber; the Gossip, Monsieur de Roban, bare the Bairn, as he did to the Kirk, my Lord Lyon, Master of Cerelxxii INTRODUCTION.

Ceremonies, Heralds, Pursevants, Trumpets

founding before us.

And thereafter, his Majesty passed to the mikle Hall to Supper; his Majesty sat on her Majesty's Left-hand; beneath his Majesty sat the two Brothers Frenchmen, where they were magnificently entertained. My Lord Mar was Great Master Houshold, in Place of the Earl of Argyle; Sir James Sandilands, Mr. Usher, in Place of my Lord Fleming; Sir James Douglas served as Master of Ceremonies, in Place of William Shaw. Sir Thomas Erfkin Master of the Guards. My Lord Lyon ferved in his Coat at Supper; my Lord President served the King at Supper, as Cupper; my Lord Spynie, Carver; my Lord Roxburgh, Sewer. Upon the West Side of the Hall, sat fundry Lords and Dames, and the two Frenchmen's Servants - Ay a Nobleman and a Dame placed: The Marquis of Huntly, Chancellor, Cassils, Mar, Winton, Livingston, with fundry other Noblemen, and Lords of secret Council at the Board. Upon Wednesday at Even, the two noble Frenchmen and the Nobility supped with his Majesty.

ERRATA.

P. 20, line 9, for rependes, read reprendes.

P. 41, Notes, line 4, dele whom.

P. 22, line 6. from the Bottom, for your Lordship's, r. his Lordship's.

P. ibid. line 4, from the Bottom, for the some, read the same. P. 326. line 6, for whether, read nay whether.

The CASE of the ROYAL MARTYR Confidered with CANDOUR;

OR, AN

ANSWER

TO A

LETTER

INTITLED,

A Letter to a Clergyman, relating to his Sermon on the 30th of January: Being a compleat Answer to all the Sermons that EVER HAVE BEEN, OR EVER SHALL BE preached in the like Strain on that Anniversary.

By ****, Merchant in London.

Quid dignum tanto feret hic promissor hiatu?

Διες εφμμένη καρδία τεκλαίνελαι κακά, εν ωανθί καιρώ τοι ετωρ τα εφχας συνίς ησι ω όλει. Παροιμ. Κεφ. 5.

The GASE of the Royal Marrin Confidered with Canbour;

MA , NO

AMSWER

AOT

JETTER

GEATITUE '

A Value to a Gargeman freliting to his Serden on the 30th of January: Long a conblade And we to all the Services that I year in the news, on where wash, we preach in the like Street on that Americalary.

By were Charabant in Lordon

The letter Wignesser to the first that for the form of the form of

LI Walma of A

AN

ANSWER

TOA

LETTER, etc.

LETTER I.

SIR,

Letter to a Clergyman, relating to his Sermon on the 30th of January, being a compleat Answer to all the Sermons, that EVER HAVE BEEN OR EVER SHALL BE preach'd, in the like Strain on that Anniversary. As you did not think fit to put your Name to it, when you first publish'd it, I little suspected a Merchant of the opulent City of Exeter to be the Author of it. Your Title-Page hath so much of the Air of a Town-Advertisement, that (you will pardon me) I really thought it to be the Work of some meagre Gentleman, B

who, in an upper Room, had labour'd hard for a popular Frontispiece, in order to recommend his Epistolary Packet to the Notice of the Publick. A compleat Answer to all the Sermons, that EVER HAVE BEEN or EVER SHALL BE preach'd, &cc.! Who could suspect that a Gentleman, engag'd in the Commercial World, could be capable of putting on the Character and talking in the Dialect of the most accomplish'd Empiric? I cure all Ills, PAST, PRESENT, AND TO COME, was the Language of a very eminent Person in the Medicinal Way, before either you Mr. C——de or Dr. —— made your Appearance in the World.

However, when I understood the Letter was yours, I paid it all the Deference which is due to a Brother-Adventurer in the Business of Divinity and Politics. I read it over carefully; and as your Title-Page promis'd something extraordinary, I own, I expected something new and extraordinary in your Letter. If I was disappointed, and the Quality of your Goods did not come up to the Sample, I had a Right to plead for an Abatement; and you cannot blame me, if I endeavour to do myself and the World Justice, by shewing, that you are either a very unskilful or a very unsair Trader in the

historical Accounts of your Country.

An Author, who engages in a Debate relating to the Rights and Privileges of King and People, is supposed to be Master of his Subject, and to understand the Nature of our Constitution. I expected therefore, at least, that you had given

your Readers a good Account of our English Establishment, that you had put the Debate upon a proper Footing, and only corrected the Mistakes of those, who stretch the Prerogative of the Crown beyond its due Bounds. Had your Observations been employ'd to these useful Purposes, I should have given you no manner of

Trouble upon the Occasion.

They who will have it, that the Conduct of King Charles I. was absolutely faultless; they who preach in this Strain (to use your own Words) are ignorant of the English History, and the fundamental Laws of our Constitution; and had your Remarks been levell'd against the Sentiments or Discourses of such Preachers, no One, who hath a Regard for our Constitution, could justly have blam'd you. But, upon a careful Perusal of your Performance, I find your Defign is quite otherwise. I find, amidst all your Pretensions to Moderation and Charity, that your real Defign is to traduce the Memory of a murder'd Sovereign, to asperse the establish'd Church and its Clergy, and make them as odious as possible. If this was not your Intention, why did you revive and tell over old Stories, which have been answer'd and confuted an hundred Times? Why did you amass together fuch a Heap of Scandal from that infamous Writer Oldmixon? Why would you choose to be a Plagiary from a Scribbler of the lowest Rank? Why are you so fond of his contemptible Ribaldry? of his mean, low, ludicrous Way of Writing? I own you have not express-

ly

ly quoted him throughout your Letter; and will you give me Leave to guess at your Reason for it? You knew very well, that he was a Writer of no Reputation, and therefore it was necessary that his Name should be conceal'd. You knew that he had been publickly convicted of the bafest Falseboods and Defamation *; that he had

* The intelligent Reader need not be told, that this was the Writer who first excepted to the Genuineness of Lord Clarendon's History. He tells his Readers, that that History was interpolated and alter'd in feveral Places by the Oxford Editors. The chief Evidence he produces, in support of this Great Charge, is the following Letter from one Mr. Ducket:

SIR,

" Accidentally looking on some of the Sheets of your Histo-" ry of England, during the Reigns of the Royal House of Stuart, " at the Bookseller's, I find that you mention the History of

" Lord Clarendon; wherein you justly question the Genuineness of that Book. In order to put the Matter out of Doubt, I

" here fend you the following Account:

" Mr. Edmund Smith, a Man very well known in the Learned " World, came down to make me a Visit at ****, about " June 1710; where he continued, till he died, about fix " Weeks after.

" As our Conversation chiefly ran upon Learning and Histo-" ry, you may easily think that Clarendon's was not forgotten. " Upon mentioning that Book, he frankly told me, that there " had been a fine History written by Lord Clarendon; but what

" was publish'd under his Name, was only Patch-work, and " might as properly be call'd, the History of Al-, Small-" and Atterbury; for to his Knowledge 'twas alter'd; nay, that

be himself was employ'd by them to interpolate and alter the

" Original.

" He then ask'd me, Whether I had the Book by me? If I " had, he would convince me of the Truth of his Affertion, " by the very printed Copy. I immediately brought him the " Falio Edition; and the first Thing he turn'd to, was the Cha-" racter of Mr. Hampden, where is that Expression: He had a " Head to contrive, a Heart to conceive, and a Hand to execute " any Villainy. He then declar'd, it was foisted in by those " kewerends.

not the least Authority for several Stories which he hath impos'd upon the World as Facts; and

SIR.

"I have only to add this, that he not only underlin'd this "Passage, as a Forgery, but gave, during the short time he "liv'd with me, the same Remark to some Hundreds more."

I am, Sir, &c.

And how was this Account receiv'd by the Publick, and what was the Consequence of it? Why, Bishop Atterbury liv'd long enough to hear this idle Tale, and to give an Answer to it; wherein he plainly made it appear, that either the Whole must have been invented by Mr. Ducket or Mr. Oldmixon, or both; or else that Mr. Edmund Smith (if he told Mr. Ducket, what the Letter says, he did) must have died with a Lye in his Mouth; it being certain, that neither Bishop Smalldridge nor Bishop Atterbury were any ways concern'd in preparing that History for the Press. Since the Bishop's Death, the judicious Dr. Burton has examin'd the whole Account, and shewn it to be entirely salse and groundless in all its Parts.

In the above Letter it is observable, that Mr. Smith is sup-

pos'd to have faid or infinuated to Mr. Ducket,

1. That the Deans Aldridge, Smalldridge, and Atterbury, were concern'd in the Publication of Lord Clarendon's History.

2. That he bimself was employ'd by them to interpolate and

alter the Original; and

3. That accordingly feveral Hundreds of Passages were actually alter'd, and particularly that the Character of Mr. Hampden was foisted in by those Reverends.

To the first of these Positions it has been reply'd and prov'd

beyond all Contradiction;

1. That neither Dr. Smalldridge nor Dr. Atterbury were any

ways concern'd in the Publication of the faid History;

2. That the Affertion of Mr. Smith, that he was employ'd by those Gentlemen to interpolate and alter the Original, must consequently be false, and his Evidence not much to be regarded in

any respect whatsoever

3. The third Position has likewise been disprov'd in as clear and full a Manner as can be desir'd. To omit other Proofs, the seven first Books of the Manuscript Copy of the said History have been produc'd and expos'd to publick View; and the Character of Mr. Hampden has been seen by several Persons of Distinction, in Lord Clarendon's own Hand writing. But the Account which

that no Credit would be given to Quotations from a Compiler of fuch idle Tales. If these

Dr. Burton has given us of this Particular, may possibly be more satisfactory to the curious Reader; for which Reason I shall give

it him in his own Words:

"The very controverted Clause (says the Dr.) is now to be feen in Lord Clarendon's own Hand-writing, in a smaller Work, containing the History of his Life, and from which he transcrib'd the most considerable Part into his History of the Rebellion. He there gives Mr. Hampden's Character in these Words, He had a Head to contrive, a Tongue to perswade, and a Hand to execute any Mischief; and his Death appear'd to be a great Deliverance to the Nation. 'Tis further observable, that the Latin Words from Tully are cited here, and apply'd to Mr. Hampden with this Paraphrase of them, without mentioning the Name of Cinna, as in the printed Edition, p. 226.

"In another Place, p. 83, speaking of this History of Lord "Clarendon's Life, the Dr. has these Words: This is dated from Montpelier, in the second Year of his Banishment; the Account is carried down to the Year 1645, with the Materials for the two following Years laid down, but not drawn up in Form. In this Work are the principal Characters of the Great Men engag'd on both Sides, and among these that

of Mr. Hampden, written in the Earl's own Hand.

"A Sheet or two of this MS. in which the Passage above cited occurs, was sometime ago expos'd to publick View for the Satisfaction of any curious Enquirer, in the Bodleian Library, during the Space of one Year. 'This I have perus'd, (says the Dr.) and from thence transcribed the Words.

"But what is still more directly to the Purpose, I must in"form the Reader (says he) that, contrary to the Expectation of
the Objectors, it happens that there are still extant some Parts;
and as I am inform'd, the seven first Books of this History of
the Rebellion, written by the Earl's own Hand, in which this
controverted Clause is contain'd, Mr. Hampden's Character is
there given in the very same Words, which appear in the
printed History. This MS. is at present in the Possession of
Mr. Radcliffe of Bartlett's Buildings, in Holbourn, who was
one of the Executors of the last Earl of Clarendon. To this
the importunate Enquirer is referr'd for the Satisfaction of his
Curiosity. Many Persons of Distinction have been favour'd
with the Sight of it; among whom I have heard mention'd
the Lord Chancellor King, the Speaker of the House of Com-

were not your Reasons for concealing his Name, why did you not refer to him in your

" mons, Dr. George Clarke, &c. (See the Genuineness of Lord Clarendon's History, by John Burton, B. D. printed 1744)

" Page 59."

As these are direct plain Proofs of the Genuineness of the controverted Passage, and carry an irrefragable Consutation of the Falsehoods published by Mr. Oldmixon, is it possible that any Writer, who hath the least Spark of Honesty belonging to him, who has the least Regard for Truth or his own Reputation, can be capable of seriously reviving this groundless, this villainous Calumny? And yet in the Presace to a Pamphlet lately publish'd, intituled, An Essay towards attaining a true Idea of the Character of K. Charles, I find this Charge infisted upon as and urg'd with as great Assurance, as if it was an undoubted Truth, which had neither been consuted or so much as question'd.

"This celebrated History (Clarendon's) says the Author, lies under strong Suspicion, if not evident Proof, of being surther fosten'd and garbled in favour of that Cause by many gross. Interpolations and Alterations of the Editors. One of them, the learned Mr. Smith of Christ Church, Oxon, acknowledg'd upon his Death-Bed, that himself had been concern'd in it. There was, (said he, and they were some of his last. Words, of whose Truth there can be no Doubt) a fine History written by Lord Clarendon, but what was publish'd under his Name, was only Patch-work. — "And as the original Manuscript hath never been produc'd to remove these Suspicions, but is kept under a Veil of impenetrable Secrecy, there remains little Room to doubt of some unfair and dishonourable Dealing in the Case." (Presace to the Essay, p. 3.)

I have not Room, in this Place, to make proper Remarks upon this and some other Passages in that samous Performance, and must therefore deser it at present. When I have done with Mr. C—de, that Gentleman may possibly hear from me; and if it does not appear that he has outdone Mr. Oldmixon, Mr. C—de, &c. in their most distinguish'd Perfections, in the most base Misrepresentations of Facts and Characters, in salse Quotations, in wrong Conclusions, and such pitiful Evasions, as plainly betray the Weakness of his Cause, as well as the Distress and Disingenuity of the Manager, I will acknowledge myself to be entirely ignorant of the Hissory of K. Charles I.

I cannot help making a Remark or two. If Writers go on to improve the groundless Calumny above mention'd, as is here done by the Author of the Essay, &c. it must in time grow into

Margin, as well as to Rushworth, Whitlock, Ludlow, &cc. whom I have good Reason to be-

a very formidable Charge. This Author has manifestly improv'd the Story beyond any one who went before him. He does not scruple to relate it with Circumstances, which were never before told or heard of. He expressly tells his Readers,

That Mr. Edmund Smith was one of the Editors of Lord Cla-

rendon's History; and

That he acknowledg'd upon his Death-Bed, that he had been

concern'd in interpolating and altering it.

One of them (i. e. the Editors) fays he, the learned Mr. Edmund Smith, acknowledg'd upon his Death-Bed, that he had been concern'd in it. Even Mr. Olamizon never ventur'd to tell this infamous Tale in a manner so manifestly void of Truth. And what Authority has this Author for these additional Embellishments? None at all. — Even Mr. Ducket's Letter (the only Authority for the whole Story) will not warrant him in either of the Assertions.

It is not pretended in the Letter, that Mr. Smith was one of the Editors; but only a Person employ'd by the Editors to alter the Original; but this Author puts him down directly for one of the Editors; for one who was intrusted with the Publication of

the History.

Again, it is said in the Letter, that Smith made Mr. Ducket a Visit; that be continued with him about six Weeks, and then died; that their Conversation ran chiefly upon Learning and History, particularly upon that of Lord Clarendon; that, during the short time that be liv'd with him, he scor'd or underlin'd several Passages in it, which he declar'd were Interpolations. But does it follow from hence, that he declar'd or acknowledg'd this upon his Death-Bed? that this was his Death-Bed Confession? that these were some of his last Words, of whose Truth there can be no Doubt? No; this is an Improvement of our Author's.

But when we are affur'd that the whole Account, as far as it

relates to Lord Clarendon's History, is absolutely false:

That Smith (if he told Mr. Ducket what the Letter fays he did) must have told him the most notorious Falsehoods; when we are certain,

That neither Dr. Smalldridge nor Dr. Atterbury were any ways

concern'd in the Publication of the History;

That consequently Smith was so far from being one of the Editors, or employ'd by the Editors, that he did not know who were concern'd in the Publication of the Work.

lieve

lieve you never read +. But to proceed to Particulars: I have but one Objection or two at most to your Dedication, P. 7. you tell us, that the Learned Prelate, to whom you dedicate,

When we are further affur'd, that all those Parts of the Manuscript Copy (of which there is or can be any Dispute) are still extant; that they have been produc'd, expos'd to public View, and seen by several Persons of Distinction; when all this is well known to be Fact, and consequently the whole Story appears to have been an infamous Invention, either of him who first published it, or of him who first related it. What can possibly reach the Ignorance or Insolence, the Baseness and Dissingenuity of a Writer, who shall presume not only to revive the abovemention'd Calumny, but to relate it with greater Assurance than ever, and with Circumstances, which were never before told or heard of?

† In order to fatisfy the Reader, that I have good Reason for what I say, and that I do not abuse Mr. C— in this Respect, I will give him an Instance or two, amongst many, wherein Mr. C—'s Words will be found to be near the same with Mr. Oldmixon's, but very different from those of the Author's, to whom he refers. The following Paragraph is found in Mr. C—de, page 24, and in Mr. Oldmixon's History, p. 132.

RUSHWORTH fays, when once the Star began to swell big, and was delighted with Blood, which was not till Laud's Time, springing out of the Ears and Noses, &c. (says Mr. Oldmixon) who made it spring out of the Ears and Noses, &c. (says Mr. C—de). Not a Word of the following Improvement (vix. which was not till Laud's Time, who made it spring out) is to be

met with in Rushworth, Vol. II. p. 475.

This was the only Work, says Mr. C—de, p. 15. of which the Clergy were judg'd capable. —But this was not the only Work, says Ludlow, of which the Clergy were judg'd capable, Lud. Memoirs, Vol I p. 5. There are other Passages in Mr. C—de's Letter, said to be quoted from Ludlow's Memoirs, which are not found in Ludlow, at least not in the Pages referr'd to.

This hellish Cruelty (meaning Leighton's Punishment) says Mr. C—de. p. 28. does Bishop Laud in his Closet write down at LARGE, in his Diary, with Delight One would think, some People delighted in Lying. The Words to this Purpose in the Diary are no more than these; Now. 26. Friday, part of this Sentence was executed upon hom at Westminster.

had prov'd, beyond all reasonable Contradiction, that Christ's Kingdom was not of this World; but this Doctrine, it seems, was new and surprizing, even to the greatest Part of the Clergy. What now, says Mr. C——de, could your Lordship expect but Judgment without Mercy! It was a Crime of such a Nature, as never to be forgiven. To be told, that Christ's Kingdom did not consist in Mitres, Lordships, Deanaries, Vestments, Ceremonies, Spiritual Courts, Absolutions, Persecutions, &c. &c. &c. it was next to the Sin against the Holy Ghost, and for which your Adversaries will never forgive you either in this World or the next.

But pray, Mr. C-de, what Clergyman of the Church of England ever maintain'd, that the Kingdom of Christ consisted in Mitres, Lordflips, and Deanaries? And if not, how is it possible, that a Gentleman of your Candor, Moderation, and great Regard for Truth, could be capable of fuch an unhandsome, such an uncharitable Infinuation? How is it possible that you could represent the greatest Part of a Body of Protestant Divines in such an invidious Light? He who is ignorant of a Controversy, is in the wrong to meddle with it; and he who mifrepresents it, or puts it in a wrong Light, in order to asperse either of the Parties engag'd, is fomething worse. Either you know nothing of the Debate you speak of, or else you have basely misrepresented it.

The Writers who took Exceptions to the Pishop of Bangor's Sermon, preach'd before the

King,

King, March 31, 1717, thought his Lordship had dropt some unguarded Expressions, with respect to the Nature of Christ's Kingdom, and accordingly publish'd their Sentiments upon the Subject. If in the Warmth of their Debate, they were guilty of any Indecencies towards bis Lordship, they were greatly to blame. But does it follow from hence, that they were a Set of superstitious Bigots? that they were Favourers of a Popish Hierarchy? that they were of Opinion, that the Kingdom of Christ confisted in Mitres, Lordships, Deanaries, &c? Yes, and not only fo, but that they were a Parcel of angry, persecuting Zealots, who never will forgive his Lordship either in this World or the next. But why fo? why? because they were told, that the Kingdom of Christ did not confist in Mitres, Lordships, &c. - Strange indeed! What fo very angry with his Lordship for afferting what they never deny'd?

Supposing, it should be made appear that his Lordship's Antagonists never disagreed with him, as to the Point you mention; that their Dispute was of a different Nature, that they manag'd the Controversy with full as much Temper and Decency, as we meet with in the charitable, the bumane Mr. C——de's Letter; supposing all this should be made appear, who must we conclude to be the superstitious, angry, unforgiving Zealots, THEY who objected to his Lordship's unguarded Expressions, or THEY who ignorantly or wilfully and basely misrepresent the Debate between them, with a manifest

Defign

Defign to render the establish'd Clergy odious

and contemptible?

In order therefore to undeceive your Readers, and give them a Specimen of your Ingenuity and great Regard for Truth, I shall beg Leave to mention a Word or two with respect to the

Debate we are speaking of.

The Right Reverend the Bishop of Bangor being call'd upon to preach before his Majesty on the 31th of March 1717, chose for his Text the following Words, My Kingdom is not of this World. From these Words his Lordship took Occasion (with what Propriety I am not to dispute at present) to speak of the Nature and Extent of Church-Authority, concluding that the Kingdom of Christ and the Church of Christ were fynonymous Terms. Now though I de not pretend to any great Skill in Divinity, much less in Controversies of this Kind, yet I am pretty certain that no Writer, who excepted to his Lordship's Doctrine, ever pretended that the Authority of the Church confifted in Mitres, Lordships, or Deanaries. No, Mr. C-de, this is a Suggestion of your own. And can you conceive that his Lordship, to whom you dedicate, can be pleafed with fuch a paultry Sneer, with fuch insolent Flattery? Flattery founded in Libel and Falsehood? You yourself must know it to be mean, ludicrous Invective. A Gentleman of your Penetration cannot but perceive, that the Episcopal Character is something very different from the civil Honour which Christian Princes and States have thought proper to annex

nex to it. You cannot be so weak as not to perceive that the Powers and Privileges belonging to the former, have no immediate Relation to or Connexion with those of the latter. And why then Mr. C—— would you make the World believe, that the Clergy consider the one as an essential Part of the other.

But perhaps you imagine, there is something of Popery in a Mitre. — If this was the Case, can you conceive, that the pious, the protestant, the fincere, the orthodox Prelate, to whom you dedicate, would have fuffer'd it to have been put even upon his Coach-door? No; depend upon it, a Mitre or a Lordship is nothing more than an honourable Mark of Civil Distinction; and is it possible that the zealous Mr. C-can be displeas'd that such a Mark of Honour is annex'd to the Ministerial Function? A Gentleman of your Zeal for Religion must, no doubt, be rather pleas'd, that the Ministers of Christ are thus dignify'd and distinguish'd, that the Civil Powers have done them fuch great Honour. Good Men, Mr. C-, rejoice to fee such publick Encouragement given to the Preachers of Righteousness; and none but Infidels, Libertines, and Pools, defire to fee them mean and contemptible.

The Church of England not only confiders the Honour done her Bishops as a Civil Dignity, but with all dutiful Submission acknowledges, that the Authority by which they EXERCISE their Function in their respective Dioceses, is a Privilege which they derive from the Crown,

his Majesty being the supreme Head of all his People, Ecclesistical as well as Civil, within his Dominions. But the Episcopal Character she conceives to be deriv'd from other Hands. She is of Opinion, that her Bishops, as such, without Mitres or Lordships, have a Power to ordain, to preach, to baptize, to exhort, to censure, &c. nor can you name a single Antagonist of his Lordship the Bishop of Bangor, who ever advanced any other Doctrine; who ever afferted that the spiritual Character of those who preside in the Church was deriv'd from or consisted in Mitres, Lordships, Deanaries, or any such secular Honours or Advantages.

Their Dispute indeed was partly about the Nature and Extent of Church Authority; but not whether it consisted in Mitres and Lordships. This was never so much as suggested by the Writers on either Side. The principal Point in Dispute was, whether what his Lordship had advanced in his Sermon did not amount to a Denial of all Church Authority; or whether, according to his Lordship's Doctrine, the Governors of the Church had any Power to judge,

censure, or punish Offenders at all.

His Lordship had expressly asserted (SERMON, PAGE 11.) that as to the Affairs of Conscience and Salvation, Christ hath left no visible human Authority behind him; and (PAGE 14.) that when Men assume such a Power, it is taking Christ's Kingdom out of his Hands and placing it in their own.

These and other Assertions of the like Nature were conceiv'd to be a Denial of all Church Authority; and accordingly his Lordship's Antagonists charg'd him with asserting, that Christ had left no Delegates, no subordinate Officers in his Church to act for or under him; none to car-

ry on the Ends of his Kingdom.

To this his Lordship reply'd, that by these and such like Assertions, he only meant, that no absolute Authority was lodg'd with any Man or Body of Men, upon Earth; that no one had an Authority to interpret the Laws of Christ, or to judge or censure Offenders in such a Sense as could absolutely affect their Salvation, or oblige them absolutely and indispensably to submit to their Interpretations or Decisions; that he never knew or heard of any Church, except the Church of Rome in its latter corrupted State, which ever dar'd to claim such an Authority.

As to this Point bis Lordship was certainly right, and with him all his Antagonists perfectly agreed. They all agreed, that no absolute Authority (that is, an Authority unlimited, unconditional, and unrestrain'd, which is always to be obey'd by every Individual, that is subject to it, in all Circumstances) they all agreed, I say, that no such Authority was lodg'd with the Governors of the Church, or any Governors upon Earth. It was unanimously allow'd,

That if Kings themselves injoin Things contrary to the Word of God, we are to obey God,

rather than Man;

That if the Ministers of Christ, in their perfonal Capacity, teach Doctrines repugnant to the Scriptures, they are not to be hearken'd to:

That if the Collective Body of the Clergy, legally affembled, agree upon any Determinations or Decisions; if they frame any Articles or Canons, contrary to what we are taught in the Holy Scriptures, they cannot bind the Confcience. But does it follow from hence,

That we are to pay no Obedience to the law-

ful Commands of Sovereign Princes?

No Regard to the wholesome Instructions of lawful Pastors and Teachers?

No Deference to the just and warrantable Decrees of the Collective Body of the Clergy le-

gally affembled?

Absolute Authority, Mr. C—de, is utterly disclaim'd by the Church of England; and the Question was, whether it follow'd from hence that there was no such thing as Church Authority at all. This, Sir, was the Point in Dispute, not whether the Kingdom of Christ consisted in Mitres, Lordships, Deanaries and Persecutions. That this is a true State of the Case, will appear from the Words of his Lordship and one of the learned Gentlemen, who reply'd to him.

When Dr. Snape had said, that no Church Authority was to be obey'd in any thing contrary to the reveal'd Will of God *, his Lordship triumphs thus, Glorious absolute Authority indeed in your own Account, to which Christ's Subjects owe no Obedience, till they have examin'd into his own Declarations, and then they obey not

this Authority but him *.

Here, says Mr. Law, your Lordship makes nothing of that Authority, which is not absolute; and yet you think it hard to be told, that you have taken away all Church Authority. That which is absolute, you expressly deny; and here you say, that which is not absolute, is nothing at all. Where then is the Authority you have left? or how is it that Christ has impower'd any one to act in his Name?

The Nature of the Dispute, Mr. C-de, is from hence apparent. How then could you possibly give it such an unjust, such an ill-natur'd Turn? How could you possibly represent a Body of Protestant Divines in such an invidious Light? You in effect charge them with Principles, which you know, they difavow and abbor. You infinuate that they are Favourers of Bigotry, Superstition and Nonsense. You charge them with being Advocates for the most absurd, the most unchristian, the most cruel and perfecuting Tenets. You expressly tell his Lordship of Bangor, that they never will forgive him, either in this World or the next. But why fo? Why were they so very angry with his Lordship? why? because they were told, what they never deny'd; and what they and his Lordship had never the least Dispute about; because they were told that the Kingdom of Christ did not confift in Mitres, Lordships, Deanaries and Per-Secutions.

overi

^{*} The Bishop of Bangor's Answer.

But can you expect to be believ'd, when you talk or write at this rate? or is it possible that you yourfelf should believe what you have here fuggested? Now not to mention the Rudeness of addressing his Lordship in such a manner, how base, Mr. C-, is it to lay Things to the Charge of your Protestant Brethren, which you know to be false! Is this your pretended Charity? this your Zeal for the Protestant Interest? this your great Regard for Truth? this your New Testament Religion? Believe me, Sir, a modest Heathen would have blush'd even to have been suspected of such groundless Invective, fuch paultry Misrepresentation; and whether it may affect you in the same Manner or not, I will venture to fay, that the ferious and candid Reader must by this Time blush for you. A Pagan (to borrow a few more of your own elegant Words) who observes the Laws of Truth and Peace, is infinitely more religious than a profane, turbulent, shuffling, unfair Christian Writer.

Whether, upon the whole, his Lordship the Bishop of Bangor, or his Antagonists, had the

better of the Controverfy;

Whether the Church has any Authority to injoin decent Ceremonies, Vestments, &c; — Whether she has a Power to judge, censure, to declare or pronounce Absolution, in the Sense maintain'd by her Protestant Members; or

Whether, on the other hand, the Principles and Positions of his Lordship (understood in the Sense in which you Mr. C—— and some others

have

have thought proper to understand them) are more agreeable to the natural Rights of Mankind, more confiftent with the New Testament, with the Reformation and the Church of England, are Questions which do not concern you or me at prefent, they having been fully discuss'd already. However, as you are pleas'd to declare absolutely in favour of his Lordship's Positions, I will beg leave to recommend to you three [mall Treatifes, writ by Mr. Law *; and when a satisfactory Answer is given to them, I will promise to be your Disciple, and never to put my Foot in an establish'd Church more. You may possibly remember that his Lordship did not think proper to reply to them, and I believe never will. The Compliments, which I 'am well affur'd were paid the Author of them by a very great Man, may be a Secret to you; and unless that Great Man or You will undertake to answer them, I verily believe they must remain unanswer'd, as long as you and I live. What you may be able to do, I cannot fay. A Gentleman who, in one Letter, hath favour'd the World with a Compleat Answer to all the Sermons, that ever were preach'd, &c. on the 30th of January, may, in another, as far as I know, answer all the Sermons and Pamphlets which are extant.

As to the Indecency, with which the Controversy was manag'd, I shall say but little to it. You are pleas'd to tell us, that the Antagonists of his Lordship loaded him with Scandal

^{*} Mr. Law's Letters to the Bishop of Bangor.

and Reproach, with Affronts, with Indignities

and Torrents of Abuse.

If in the Warmth of the Debate, as I said before, they were guilty of any Indecencies towards his Lordship, they were greatly to blame. But is it possible that you, of all Men, Mr. C—, can take upon you to censure abusive and indecent Language.

Nec tua laudabis studia, aut aliena rependes.

If it does not appear in the following Papers, that there are more Scurrilities, more ground-less Invectives, L—s, Misrepresentations, Torrents of Abuse, &c. in one single Letter writ by a Lover of Truth and Peace, than in all the Writings of the Antagonists of his Lordship of Bangor, I will be oblig'd, Mr. G—, not only to be your Convert, but to do, (what I verily think either you or I ought to do) Publick. Penance.

I shall only add a Word or two more and dismiss your Dedication. I cannot conclude, says Mr. C—de, without taking some Notice of a late honest Performance of your Lordship's (The Plain Account) which has again drawn upon you the unjust Attacks of the Bigots of all Parties. Your Lordship could expect nothing less; its natural Design and Tendency being to beat down Mystery, Bigotry, Superstition, and Nonsense, which have been for many Ages the grand Support of the Sacerdotal Empire. What Wonder then, if your Lordship sustain'd a fresh Torrent of Abuse on this Occasion?

Whether his Lordship was abus'd or not, I cannot fay, having read but little of the Controversy. I am well affur'd, that bere is a Torrent of Abuse let loose upon some Body; and if I mistake not, upon the Clergy of the Establish'd Church. As the Clergy were the only Persons who took Exceptions to the Plain Account, They must consequently be the Bigots, from whom his Lordship could expect nothing less than those unjust Attacks which the Plain Ac-

count drew upon him.

betmaye

But why unjust Attacks? or why, Mr. Cwas his Lordship to expect such unjust Attacks from the Clergy? why? because the natural Design and Tendency of his Lordship's Book was to beat down Mystery, Bigotry, Superstition, and Nonfense, which for so many Ages have been the grand Support of the Sacerdotal Empire, that is, of the Government of that Church to which those Clergy belong. This, Mr. C-, is the obvious Construction, the plain Sense of your Words. So that, according to you, the Clergy are a Set of unjust, superstitious Bigots; and Mystery, Bigotry, Superstition, and Nonfense, have for many Ages been the grand Support of the Church, to which they belong. Whether this breathes forth that Piety, Charity, and New Testament Religion which you talk of, or whether these Elegancies do not amount to fomething very much resembling Exertions of Scurrility and Torrents of Abuse, I must leave the Reader to determine.

event agenting bloods C 3 of beer and One

One thing is certain. From hence it appears, what you mean by Charity; what by Mystery, Bigotry, Superstition, and Nonsense. You have Charity, it feems, for all Mankind, provided they act and think and believe as you do; but if any of your Fellow Christians, even your Protestant Brethren, chance to differ from you, you beg to be excus'd. They then forfeit all Pretenfions to common Civility, and commence immediately a Set of fuperstitious, nonsensical Bigots. The Grand Support of their Religion is then Mystery, Bigotry, Superstition, and Nonsense. Thus you very modestly make vourself the Standard of Knowledge, Truth, and Integrity; and that extensive Charity, that great Benevolence, which you talk so much of, is at length dwindled into a narrow, paultry Affection for those of your own way of thinking. In a word, England is at length bles'd with a Pope Francis, magisterially seated in his Chair of Infallibility, and declaring all about him (a few Orthodox Catholicks of the Separation excepted) to be a Parcel of superstitious, nonfenfical Bigots.

In the same Page you tell us, that you have read many of the Answers to this valuable Treatise (The Plain Account) but have found none of them meriting your Lordship's Observa-

tion.

Here you have vastly the Advantage of me, I own, I never was so fortunate as to read the Plain Account, &c. or the Answers to it; and if I had read them, I should perhaps have wanted

wanted Skill to have settled the Value of the one or the other in so exact and critical Manner as you have done. Not one of the Answers, it seems, was worth his Lordship's Observation. Well! 'tis a brave thing, Mr. C——, to be able to read and write and reason and determine upon Points with such an amazing Accuracy

and Conciseness.

Svir

I own freely, I confulted the worthy Rector of my Parish upon the Case, who admires your Penetration and Abilities, but fancies you are a little too hafty in your Judgment of this Matter. He talks of a Book writ by Dr. Waterland, intituled, A Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist, as laid down in Scripture and Antiquity, which he imagines must have escap'd your Notice. He affures me, that the Dr. has examin'd the Subject with great Exactness, and given a full Answer to every Particular, wherein his Lordship is thought to differ from the receiv'd Opinion of the Church of England. He tells me further, " that the Dr. to his Knowse ledge, bad a most contemptible Notion of the " PLAIN ACCOUNT; that he look'd upon it as " a very weak Performance; that be does not " wouchfafe to take the least Notice of it through-" out his whole Book; and yet has shewn that " Several Positions contain'd in it are manifestly " inconfistent with the plain Declarations of " Holy Writ, with the Sentiments of Writers in the earliest and purest Ages of Christianity; " with the Doctrines of the Reformation and adt " of diedling A.P Letter to a Clergyman,

" the Establish'd Church." But our Rector is a pretty sanguine Man, and may be mistaken.

However this be, the Plain Account may perhaps answer your Purpose much better than a Treatife, which some People may fancy to be less exceptionable. A Performance, Mr. C-de, which is intended to remove the Scruples of tender Consciences, and reconcile our Duty with our Interest, must be useful and profitable Reading. You may possibly have receiv'd Benefit by it. When a wealthy Tobacconift was ask'd by a Gentleman, whether he thought it healthy to smoak; Constitutions, Sir, fays the Tobacconist, differ; I can only speak for myself: I have found GREAT BENEFIT

by it.

I have now done with your DEDICATION, and shall proceed to confider some Passages in your Letter. It has been often observ'd by Persons of Ingenuity, that sew Epitaphs are writ in so delicate a Manner as to suit the Characters of those, and those alone, for whom they were defign'd. The Introductory Compliments and Addresses in Epistles, I find, are much of the same Nature, they being often as applicable to the Persons, by whom they are writ, as to those to whom they are directed. If this, Sir, should happen to be your Case, and you should be oblig'd to take some of your Compliments back again, yet still you will have the Credit of the Invention, and no Harm will be done of either Side. Let us try then, and in-Read of directing your Letter to a Clergyman,

give

give me Leave to direct it to Mr. C-de, Merchant in Exeter.

Sand S. I R. way as will be sound on nothing " IT is not out of Vanity, Lucre, or Party, " that I now fit down to make fome Remarks " on your late very extraordinary Letter to a " Clergyman. I must confess, I have met with some insolent Attacks made upon our " Constitution, but none, I think, fo infolent " and weak as yours; none so deserving of " publick Contempt and Cenfure. Your whole " Performance could be calculated with no " other View, than to revive old Heats and Animosities, and to raise that Spirit of Strife and Discord, which, as a good Subject (especially " at a Time when a most unnatural Rebellion was either breaking or actually broke out in the " Kingdom) it was your Duty to suppress.

I know of nothing more repugnant to the Spirit of Christianity, than for one professing the greatest Moderation and Charity, to set up for the most scurrilous Champion of a Party; fince Parties are for the most part in-" fluenc'd by Motives mean and brutal, incon-" fiftent with that unalterable Regard to Truth " and Justice, to which all Men and all Parties

" have an inviolable Claim.

"I hope you will not be offended if, in this " Address, I speak my Sentiments plainly: And " tho' I shall not fail of doing so, yet, notwithstanding the Provocation you have given, my Intention is to treat you with the Civility due

" due to your Station and Character. And if " you are not very much prejudic'd by a blind " and furious Zeal, I persuade myself I shall, " in some Degree, enlighten your Understand-" ing and awaken your Conscience, not by " Falsehoods and Disguises, not by Scurrility, " Defamation, and L-s, taken from one of " the most infamous Writers that ever any Age " produc'd, but by Facts; Facts which are found " in Histories of Credit and Reputation, and " which will argue for themselves. " It would take up too much of my Time " to enter upon all the particular Falsities, Ab-" furdities, and fallacious Reasonings, with " which your Letter is chiefly made up. I " shall only offer the following general Re-" marks to your Confideration, intreating you " to peruse them calmly, without any Party-" Spirit, divefted of all Prejudice and Partiality, " with a Temper and Disposition of Mind be-" coming a Gentleman and a Scholar, always "determin'd to submit to the Force of Truth " and Evidence: And then your own Con-" science will presently suggest to you, that great Part of your Letter is a manifest Con-" tradiction to the Religion, Laws, Government, " and true History of your Country."

Thus, Sir, you see this Part of your Letter, with a very little Alteration, may as well have been writ to yourself as to the Preacher, to whom you direct it; and when I have done with the whole, I doubt not but it will appear

pear to be as proper an Introduction to my Let-

portant Actions of his Life.

ter as yours.

The exalted Character, which the Preacher was pleas'd to give of K. Charles I. you tell us, made a very confiderable Part of his Difcourse; but it had this unlucky Circumstance attending it, that the Picture had no Affinity with the Original: Light and Darkness, Heaven and Hell, could not possibly be more opposite to each other, than the Preacher's Portrait was to the real Character of that unbappy Prince.

To this I can make no Reply, it being impossible for me to know what the Preacher faid upon the Occasion, or whether such a Sermon, as you allude to, was ever preach'd at all. If fuch a Sermon was preach'd, and if the Gentleman said more of the Royal Martyr than he really deferv'de he was to blame. They who will have it that the Conduct of that unfortunate Prince was faultless, they who preach in this Strain, as I told you before, are manifestly wrong, and do little Credit to the Cause, they pretend to espouse. The Question, with respect to this Particular, is not whether K. Charles had Faults, but whether his Faults were of fuch a Nature as to justify what you call a necessary Opposition, and what Lord Clarendon and others Style Rebellion in his Subjects.

The Method you take to decide this Question seems, at first Sight, to be very fair. You promise to give us K. Charles's true and genuine Character, which, at this Distance of Time, you justly observe, can only be done by an im-

partial

partial Recital of the most considerable and important Actions of his Life. But have you really been as good as your Word? Have you given us an impartial Recital of the most considerable and important Actions of his Life? The candid Reader, I flatter myself, will soon be of another Opinion. However, admitting for once, that you have executed this Part of your Design with Fidelity, does it appear that the Actions, which you ascribe to his Majesty, were of such a Nature as to justify a Rebellion in his Subjects? as to justify their taking up Arms and deposing him?

The true and genuine Character of a Prince, who liv'd near a Century ago, can only be known by a faithful Recital of his Actions from Writers of Credit and Authority. As to Authors who were engag'd in the Rebellion, and immediately concern'd in the Murder of his Majesty, they were manifestly Parties in the Cause, and can't be deem'd either proper Evidence or proper Judges. For though I would not discredit every Thing, which such Writers have said against the King, yet it can't be expected that they should represent his Actions and Behaviour in so sair a Light, as Writers who were unconconcern'd and unprejudic'd.

And with Respect to the Testimonies of Writers, whose Characters are notoriously infamous, whose Histories are fill'd with Lampoons, instead of authentic Records, no Stress can be laid upon them at all. Writers who, as a late Author justly observes, have prostituted their Pens to the meanest,

meanest, the most mercenary Purposes, who are known to have been void of every Qualification which could possibly recommend them to the Learned World, who had neither Honesty or Abilities, who have been publickly convicted of the basest Falsehoods and Defamation, can, I presume, have no Weight in determining the Debate between us. No, Sir, the only Means to come at the true and genuine Character of a Person, who liv'd so long ago, is by a faithful Recital of his Actions from Authors of Credit and Authority; and on this Footing I will join Issue with you, and rest the Cause of the Royal Martyr.

The Design of your Letter, you expressly tell us, Page 35, is to convince all, into whose Hands it may fall, that K. Charles was the very Perfon who did deliberately and strenuously endeavour to subvert and destroy the Constitution of this Kingdom, and to substitute in its Room a wicked, lawless and tyrannical Power over the

Lives and Properties of his Subjects.

Let us see then what you have offer'd in Proof of this great Charge. And here we are told.

1. That the Queen his Mother was heard to fay, he was a very perverse, naughty Boy; for which, undoubtedly, if true, he ought to have been whipp'd, but not murder'd.

2. That soon after he came to the Throne, he marry'd a French Papist, order'd a Chapel to be built for her, and permitted her to say her Prayers (wicked Man to grant her such a Toleration) leration) ay! and to fay them in the very Manner in which she thought it her Duty to say them, and to have a Parcel of Priests about her, whom she, deluded Woman, believ'd in her Conscience to be the only proper Persons to assist her in her Devotions. And

3. That he wrote to the Pope with the Title of Most Holy Father; yes, and I dare say, to the tyrannical and popish K. of France, by the

Title of the most Christian King.

Upon the Strength of these and some other Arguments of the like Nature, which follow, and which will be taken Notice of immediately, you had undoubtedly great Reason to triumph, and accordingly you fall foul of poor K. Charles and the Clergy in a most unmerciful Manner; and after the Example and in the Language of your Great Master Oldmixon, you pronounce them all Fools and Bigots, without further Ceremony. King CHARLES I. (fays Mr C-, Page 4.) was a staunch Bigot, and consequently the Darling of the Clergy; and baving no great Reach of his own, was govern'd by his Priests, who have been always unfortunate when they meddle in Politics. His whole Reign was one continued Series of Follies or Infringements of the Rights of his Subjects. He liv'd in the constant and open Violation of the fundamental Laws of the Realm, and conducted every Thing to the Dishonour and Reproach of the English Nation.

As a Charge of this heinous Nature will require more Proof than is generally alledg'd up-

on the Occasion, I shall, before I reply to your Evidence, beg Leave to lay before the Reader a few more of those incontestable Facts of yours,

which are to argue for themselves.

4. You go on then and tell us, that King Charles, contrary to his Promise, refus'd to relieve the distress'd Protestants at Rochelle; and that he agreed with the Marquis D'Essiat, the French Minister, for a Squadron of Men of War to join the French Fleet at DIEPPE, which was sitting out against them.

5. That as soon almost as he came to the Throne, he dispens'd with the Laws against Papists in an arbitrary Manner, and openly de-

clar'd bis Encouragement of Popery.

6. That he was guilty of very illegal and arbitrary Steps in apprehending a great Number of leading Men of both Houses of Parliament; that Sir Dudley Diggs was hurried away to the Tower under the Pretence of undutiful Speech; and that Sir John Elliot, another famous Speaker in the House of Commons, was committed close Prisoner with many others, contrary to the repeated Petitions and Remonstrances of the House of Lords and House of Commons.

7. That at length, tir'd with frequent Petitions and Remonstrances of both Houses in Vindication of their just and legal Rights, in order to establish his absolute Power and Dominion over the Lives and Properties of his Subjects, he determin'd to have no Parliament at all; and that accordingly he dissolved that Parliament,

and call'd no other during the twelve following Years.

8. That during the twelve Years, when no Parliament was call'd, the King govern'd as arbitrarily as the Grand Signior, and in a manner subversive of all the Fundamental Laws of the Realm; that in the first seven Years he publish'd no less than one hundred and forty fix Proclamations, the chief Defign of which was to raife Money without Confent or Authority of Parliament, under the Denomination of Conduct Money, Tunnage, Poundage, Ship-Money, &c. &c. that when some of the Lawyers began to exert themselves in Defence of the People's Rights and Privileges, and declar'd, that it was illegal to impose Taxes without Consent of Parliament, the Court created or reviv'd arbitrary Courts, as the Star-Chamber and High-Commission Courts, wherein monstrous Cruelties were daily committed, even on Persons of high Rank, Quality and Learning.

9. That the King by these, and numerous other illegal and tyrannical Asts, had at length so incens'd the People, that he found himself reduc'd to great Streights and Dissipulties; that therefore on the 3d of November 1640, he summon'd a Parliament, and pass'd a Bill, whereby he divested himself of the Power of dissolving, or so much as proroguing them, without their own Consent; but that his Compliance in this respect, was so far from atoning for past Miscarriages, that the very Compliance itself was criminal; that he hereby subverted the Constitution of his Country

Country to his own Prejudice, as he had afore violated it in numerous Instances, to the Detriment of his Subjects; for though he confented to pass an Act, which looked like a well-meant Concession, yet it seems, that be had no Intention of satisfying the Demands, or redressing the Grievances, of his Subjects; that his Defigns were still arbitrary and tyrannical; that he fully intended to establish Popery or something like it; in a word, that he had nothing in his Head or his Heart, but to subvert the Constitution and en-

Slave bis People.

Her been bottom and the

of Edulated the A heavy and heinous Charge indeed! but it is to be hop'd, not so very heinous as you reprefent it. Had King Charles been such a worthless, arbitrary, weak Bigot, as you would make him, is it possible, that one of the most august Assemblies upon Earth, the King, Lords and Commons in Parliament, would have done him the Honour to declare him a Martyr for the Protestant Religion, and to institute an Anniversary, for detesting the treasonable Principles and Practices, by which he was deposed and murdered? Is it possible, if the Character which you have given us of his Majesty, was his true and genuine Character, that such an august Assembly would have declared their Abhorrence of his Murder. and the rebellious Practices which brought it about, in such a solemn Manner? I beg you will read their Declaration upon the Occasion, and then tell me, whether they, who must neceffarily know the King, as well as Mr. C-de

at least, could possibly have thought him such a lawless Tyrant, as you have made him.

We do renounce, abominate, and protest against, that impious Fast, committed by a Party of wretched Men, desperately wicked, and hardened in their Impiety, the execrable Murder, and most unparallel'd Treason, against the facred Person and Life of K. Charles the Ist. and ALL Proceedings Tending Thereunto; an borrid Action, by which the Protestant Religion bath received the greatest Wound and Reproach, and the People of England the most insupportable Shame and Infamy, that it was possible for the Enemies of God and the King to bring upon us; while the fanatick Rage of a few Miscreants (who were as far from being true Protestants, as they were from being true Subjects) flands imputed by our Adversaries to the whole Nation. And for the better Vindication of ourselves to Posterity, and as a tasting Monument of our otherwise inexpressible Detestation and Abhorrency of this villanous and abominable Fast, we keep and observe this anniversary Day of Fast-ing and Humiliation, to implore the Mercy of God, that neither the Guilt of that facred and innocent Blood, nor those other Sins, by which God was provoked to deliver up both us and our King into the Hands of cruel and unreasonable Men, may, at any time bereafter, be visited upon us or our Posterity. 12 Car. II. 30.

You have here the Sense of Parliament with respect to the Murder of K. Charles, and the rebellious Proceedings tending thereunto; and till

you had been well affured that their Sentiments in this Respect were absolutely wrong, it had been decent in you, to have acquiesced in the Sense of the Great Council of the Nation; at least to have paid as great Deference to their Wisdom and Integrity, as to the idle and infamous Tales of a Writer, who, I flatter myself, before I have finished my Letter, will appear to be a Writer of less Credit than Mr. G-de is aware of. But was he an Author of greater Reputation than he really is, is he to be fet up as the Standard of Truth? Is he of Authority fufficient to confront the Sense of Parliament, (I will venture to add) the most authentick Histories and Records which are extant? And yet this Writer (though you don't care to own it) is your principal Authority; there being scarce a Paragraph of Consequence relating to the Conduct of the unfortunate Prince we are speaking of (a few Improvements of your own excepted) but what is taken, almost verbatim, from the celebrated Mr. Oldmixon.

But Facts, you will say, are stubborn Things; and, whether reported by Mr. Oldmixon, or any one else, must determine the Point between us.

Very true, provided they are real and pertinent Facts, provided they are Facts fairly represented, and full Proofs of the Point for which they are alledged. Whether this be the Case will appear immediately.

When I first read your Character of the Royal Martyr, I could not help recollecting a humotous Story of a peevish and conceited Limner,

D 2

who drew the Picture of a Lady that was a little crooked, but otherwise a Lady of great Beauty. He had often defired her to fit for her Picture; but the Lady having but a mean Opinion of his Abilities, treated his Importunity with great Contempt, and at last refused to see him, or admit bim into ber House. At this Usage the Gentleman was highly offended, and meditated Revenge. He knew the Lady was a constant Attendant upon the publick Devotions, and accordingly stole a fide View of her Face at Church, and drew her in that Attitude. By this means, he could shew the little Defect which attended her Person behind; and the exquisite Charms of a most beautiful Face were in some measure concealed. A Gentleman viewing the Piece, and gueffing at the Lady for whom it was intended, observed, It is pity, Sir, you had not given us a full View of fo fine a Face! Yes, Sir, fays the Artist, with an ill-natured Sneer, but then my main Intention had been defeated. That exalted Grace, that tip-top Perfection there (pointing to the Lady's Shoulder) which is now perspicuous, had been quite out of Sight.

You promised to give us the true and genuine Character of K. Charles; by which I apprehended we were to have had his whole Character. I expected, at least, you would have given us a full and fair Representation of his good and bad Qualifications, of his Virtues and Foibles, as far as they had any Connection with his regal Charater. But according to you, he had not one single Virtue belonging to him, he had neither Religion,

Religion, Honesty, or Common-sense; but was a weak, misguided Bigot; an arbitrary, lawless, unjust Tyrant, who had nothing in his Head or his Heart, but absolute Rule and Oppression.

But pray, Sir, who told you so? Why, Mr. Oldmixon. But where had Mr. Oldmixon his Information? Either from his own dear prolifick Brain, or else from the Lampoons of Party-Scriblers, or the Memoirs of Writers, who were manifestly prejudiced Persons: who were either bitter Enemies to all kingly Government, or Parties too deeply engaged to be proper Judges in the Cause; who were Promoters of the Rebellion, and wrote the most virulent Lampoons against the Government, or else were immediately concerned in dethroning and murdering the King. Now, Sir, is it possible you can expect the true and genuine Character of his Majesty from fuch Persons? From Persons who, in Vindication of their own rebellious Principles and Practices, were obliged to asperse him, and load his Administration with all the Reproaches that their Wit and Wickedness could invent? No. Sir, from fuch Writers you can expect nothing but a Display of his Majesty's Faults and Miscarriages, aggravated with every Circumstance necessary to make him arbitrary and odious. And are not these fit Materials for forming a Judgment of his regal Conduct? for drawing his true and genuine Character?

If the Characters of Persons in Trade were to be dealt with in such a Manner, I am thinking, Mr. C——de, what fort of Figure you and I

should make in the commercial World. I fancy, our Credit would be of much less Importance than it is at present. I fear, we should want an Office to ensure our Reputations as well as our Goods, and be obliged sometimes to ensure more than the World would allow us to be posses-

fed of.

Were the Gentry of the present Age to be described by their Foibles and Follies, and only the dark Side of their Characters to be exposed to publick View; was it a Rule to blazon and record their Vices instead of their Virtues and Atchievements, how must Posterity stand amazed, at the hopeful Race of Heroes and Patriots which this Nation was blessed withal in the 17th Century! No Man, Mr. C——de, is without his Faults, and was your Method of giving Characters to take place, the principal and best Part of Mankind must appear to be a Set of Fools, Bigots, and Knaves.

A Person whose general Behaviour entitles him to the Character of an honest Man; who, upon the whole, conducts himself agreeable to the Rules of Honour, Religion, and Truth, has a Right to the Esteem of his Fellow Creatures. And if he should be guilty of any Inadvertencies, which do not appear to be strictly warrantable, are we immediately to set him down for a Rogue and a Villain? No, Sir, common Humanity obliges us to think and act in a quite different Manner. We are obliged to put a favourable Construction upon his most inadvertent Actions; we are obliged to conclude (unless full Proof ap-

pears

pears to the contrary) that they were the Result of Mistake or Misinformation; of Surprize or Necessity; that either he was obliged to do what he did, or else that he was misted by wrong Advice, and surprized into a Conduct which he believed to be just and right. This Candor, Sir, is due to every one who hath the Character of an honest Man.

But if the same Person is made sensible of a mistaken Practice, and endeavours by all possible Methods to satisfy the Demands of an offended Community, he hath fully attored for unavoidable Miscarriages; and all injurious Treatment of him subsequent to such a Condescension, is

ungenerous, base, and cruel.

Now, if such Treatment is but the just Demand of every, the lowest Member of a civilized Community, I hope the Circumstance of being advanced to a Throne, will not deprive a Person of the same Privilege. The Actions of an anointed Sovereign, who is ordained by God, and to whom his People owe the most solemn Allegiance, have surely an equal Claim to the same favourable Construction, which, by the Laws of common Humanity, is due to the Conduct of his meanest Subjects.

Upon this Footing then let us examine the Actions of the Royal Martyr, and see whether he was that weak, misguided Bigot, that arbitrary, lawless Tyrant, which you have made him; or whether any, or all the Faults which you have laid to his Charge, were sufficient to justify the unparalleled Rebellion of his Subjects.

D 4

I. Then

1. Then you tell us, that he was a Lad of a most perverse Disposition; that his Mother was heard to say of him in publick, that she feared he would live to be the Ruin of himself, and occasion the Loss of his three Kingdoms by his Obstinacy.

2. That soon after he came to the Throne, he

married a French Papist, &c. And,

3. That he wrote to the Pope, with the Title

of Most Holy Father.

Now supposing all this to be true, what is it to the Purpose? Did his Majesty, by marrying a Papist, or writing to the Pope, &c. transgress any of the fundamental Laws of the Realm? Or does it follow from hence that he himself was a Papist, or inclined to Popery? No: Mr. C—de, you and I may write, and be very complaisant to each other, and yet think (as God knows we do) in a very different Manner. A Presbyterian or an Insidel, you know, may write, and dedicate to a Bishop of the Church of England, and have no great Regard for either the Order, or the Church to which he belongs.

But K. Charles was a very perverse, naughty Boy.—It may be so; and yet he may have been a very honest Man. His Behaviour in the Nursery is no Proof that he was a lawless, oppressive Tyrant on the Throne; and when the Story of an old Scotish Nurse * is urged as a

Proof

^{*} Lilly the Astrologer says, Mr. Oldmixon tells us, the old Scotish Lady, bis (K. Charles's) Nurse, was used to affirm, that he was of a very evil Nature, even in his Insancy; and the Lady, who asterwards took Charge of him, cannot deny it, but that he was beyond Measure wilful and unthankful. Page 88.

Proof of your incontestable Facts, you must excuse me if I treat it as such; if I look upon it as an idle old Woman's Tale, and nothing to the Purpose.

Mr. Oldmixon is so fond of this Story, that he gives it his Readers no less than three Times in the Course of his History; and yet (according to his usual Modesty) laughs at the Author from whom whom he takes it, and plainly intimates (page 101) that he looked upon him as a filly, tristing Writer, who deserved little or no Credit. But such an Inconsistency will appear to be a small Fault in Mr. Oldmixon. If a Conjurer or a Fool, a Rogue or a Regicide, says any thing in Prejudice to K. Charles, Mr. Oldmixon seldom scruples to admit it as good Evidence; but if the Accounts of a Writer are found in any the least Respect to be consistent with those of Lord Clarendon or Mr. Echard, he is to be exposed and ridiculed.

This fame Lilly the Aftrologer, whose Evidence (page 80) was deemed very good in the Case just mentioned, is called (page 101) the Conjurer, and quoted only to be laughed at, because by this means our Author had the Vanity to imagine, he should

discredit Lord Clarendon and Mr. Echard.

Echard, says he, speaking of the Story of the Ghost of Sir George Villiers, thought this old Woman's Tale a wonderful Rarity, being found in so notable a History as that of the Rebellion; but unfortunately, says he, the same old Woman's Tale was told before by Lilly the Astrologer, in his Observations on the Life of King Charles I.

But why unfortunately? Does this discredit the Story in Lord Clarendon? Does it not rather confirm it? Is it not a clear Proof, that there was fuch a Story in Lilly's Time? Yes; but then Lilly tells us, that the Ghost appeared to one Parker of Lambeth; whereas Lord Clarendon tells us, that the Person to whom it appeared was an Officer, who resided at Windsor-Castle. And why might not Lord Clarendon's Account be true, and the Account of the Astrologer a very great Mistake, or something worse? especially when it is acknowledged on all hands, that the latter was a very filly, trifling Writer?

The Story in Lord Clarendon is confirmed by as good concurrent Evidence as can be expected. Mr. Edmund Wyndham, a Gentleman of Somerfetsbire, wrote an Account of this Affair, much to the some Purpose with that of Lord Clarendon, which in the Year 1652, was carefully entered in the Herald's Office in London. From this Account it is clear, that the Person to whom the Apparition appeared was an Officer at Windsor-Costle, that his

But to do the utmost Justice to your Argument, I must confess, the Temper of the Child

Name was Nicholas Towfe, a Gentleman of Character and Reputation, that Mr. Wyndham was intimately acquainted with him, and, what is still more material, that he was once admitted to see the said Mr. Towfe in Conference with the Duke of Buckingham. So that the Story in Lilly seems rather to confirm than discredit the Account in Lord Clarendon, they being both in Substance the same, and the Circumstance, wherein they differ, being a Circumstance, in which it appears, that LILLY was either

ridiculously ludicrous, or absolutely mistaken.

What I shall observe further, Mr. C——de, may possibly be out of your Way. However, if the Reader will pardon the Digression, I will venture to make a Remark or two upon this famous Story, which may not be disagreeable. I own, I do not believe, that the Appearance was really a Ghost; and I think, Lord Clarendon was of the same Opinion. The Story, when his Lordship wrote, was well known and well attested; and whether there was any Thing of Contrivance in the Assair or not, the Example of Livy would fully warrant a Relation of this visionary Kind, which appears to be so pleasing a Relief to the Reader,

and so great an Ornament to the History.

Supposing a Contrivance, the Manner in which it is concealed from being obvious at first Sight is exquisitely sine. The Veil, which is thrown over it, is drawn with great Skill and Delicacy. Had the Contrivance been immediately exposed to View, the Beauty of the Piece must have vanished with the Apparition, and sunk into a surprizing Nothing; and yet the Shades, into which it is thrown, are so thin and sine, that it cannot, I think, escape a close Inspection. The serious Air, with which the Story is told, and the beautiful, the artful Negligence, with which the Imposition is disguised, are the Strokes of a masterly Hand. They would at first Sight incline us to believe that the Apparition was a real Messenger from the other World; but, upon a nearer View, you discover the Countess Dowager of Buckingham behind the Scenes, directing the whole Affair.

It is observable, that the Ghost was dressed in the Choaths, which Sir George Villiers wore, when the Officer, to whom he appeared, was a School-Boy, and in which Habit, he had good Reason to remember Sir George, he having received great Favours from him, at that Season of Life. Now, as it cannot be imagined, that the Countess of Buckingham would want either Interest or Opportunity to execute such a Scheme in Windsor-Castle, so no one, perhaps, could so easily have been furnished with a proper Habit for

does sometimes discover a good deal of the Man. I knew a Tradesman, who was such a little, shuffling, tricking, pilsering Knave, when a Boy, that he was often corrected by his Play-sellows for cheating and thieving; and do you think,

that Purpole, as the Lady, who was in Possession of the Family Wardrobe.

It is further observable, that when the Officer mentioned those Particulars to the Duke which were to gain him Credit, the Duke's Colour changed, and he swore he could come to that Knowledge only by the Devil; for that those Particulars were known only to himself, and to one Person more, who, he was sure, would never speak of it.

Now, who could that one Person be, but the Countes? If the Duke did not mean the Countess, why did he leave the Field, and hurry away to her Lodgings at Whitehall? If he had not suspected her of, and charged her with being the Contriver of this wifionary Scene, and with disclosing some Family Secrets, what could be the Meaning of that angry Discourse, which was observed to have passed between them? Why did he appear so displeased at quitting her Room? Or, what Account can be given of his leaving a Lady, over-whelmed in Tears, whom he had always treated with the most dutiful Respect and Esteem? The noble Historian undoubtedly intended this Part of the Narrative, as a Key to the whole. But the Reader is left to judge of this Particular, as he pleases. The few Remarks I have here made are fufficient to obviate the paultry Objections of the contemptible Scribler abovementioned, who would infinoate, that Lord Clarendon was superstitiously credulous (See Oldmixon's History, vol. i. p. 101.) It is plain on the other hand, that his Lordship had a proper Notion of the Affair, and only related the Story in Imitation of the best and most valuable ancient Writers, whom it is well known, that Scribler knew little or nothing of.

But the Character of Mr. Oldmixon, and the Authors from whence he has taken the principal Part of his Historical Materials; and the numerous and notorious Falleboods, Blunders, Inconfishencies, Misrepresentations, Scurrilities, Lownesses, &c. with which his voluminous Libel almost every where abounds, are too well known to Men of Sense and Learning to deserve any further Animadversion. At present, I shall only observe, that this is the Historian, from whom Mr. C——de has taken almost every one of those incontestable Facts, which are to justify the Grand Rebellion, and confront all the authentic Histories, which

are extant.

Mr. C—de, he could leave off his little roguish Tricks, when he grew up to be a Man? No; no more than he could leave off eating. His tricking Faculty grew upon him like the Jaundice. All his Actions were visibly tinctured with it. He had improved it to such a Degree of Dexterity with respect to Insurances, Custom-House-Duties, Privateering, &c. &c. that he seemed at last to look upon the Business of Trading as the Mercantile Art of Tricking. For he made no Scruple to cheat and abuse the very Government, from which he received great Favours. He was employed to carry Provisions to one of his Majesty's Garrisons abroad, and, in the very Ship hired at the Publick Expence, he used frequently to run Wool, and was actually caught in the Fact. And yet no one professed a greater Regard for the Publick Good; no one talked more of Honesty, of pure and undefiled Religion, than this fanctified, hypocritical Knave. Charity, universal Charity, Moderation and Benevolence were his frequent Topicks; and yet such was his Zeal for a few peculiar, absurd Tenets of his own, that he could scarce speak with Civility or Temper of any Persons, who differed from him. He treated them as a Parcel of angry, persecuting Bigots, exclaimed against them as Disturbers of the Publick Peace, as fworn Enemies of British Liberty, though at the fame Time one of his professed and favourite Principles was, that every one had a Right to think for himself. Such, Sir, is the preposterous, the inconfistent Nature of a misguided, ignorant Zeal:

Zeal; fuch the Force of perverse Dispositions in Children. Now, if it shall appear, that the Case of K. Charles was any thing like the Case here mentioned, I shall readily admit your old Scotish Nurse's Tale to be something to the Purpose.

4. You go on and tell us, that He (K. Charles) agreed with the Marquis D'Effiat, the French Minister, for a Squadron of Men of War to join the French Fleet at Dieppe, which was sitted out against the Protestants at Rochelle, thereby to destroy at once all the remaining Strength of the Reformed in that Kingdom, &c.

This Charge, with some other Particulars,

shall be considered in my next.

I am, Sir, Yours, etc.

dron was given to Care

he firittis brieseed, rage, in east

sel them seven to see history then

In the help better he bere Mr. Flore

Hatton Garden, April, 1748.

The End of the FIRST LETTER.

nather than one that and be relieved, in the

tinued of finate, that you in differ the

Peers. Hereberg and

Zell: fuch the Borce of perverte Dispositions in

LETTER II.

SIR.

I Promised you a second Letter in Vindication of the Character and Cause of the Royal Martyr, and I think myself obliged to be as good

as my Word.

You tell us, that He (K. Charles) agreed with the Marquis D'Effiat, the French Minister, for a Squadron of Men of War to join the French Fleet at Dieppe, which was sitted out against the Protestants at Rochelle, thereby to destroy at once all the remaining Strength of the Resormed in that Kingdom. The Command of this Squadron was given to Captain Pennington, whom he strictly injoined, that, in case his Ships should refuse to join the French in this vile Expedition, be should use all forcible Means to compel them; even to the sinking them, if they continued obstinate; that was, to destroy the English, his own People, if they would not destroy the French Protestants.

This Conduct appears by far the more wicked and astonishing, as the King a little before had wrote two Letters, signed Charles Rex, to the Peers, Burghers, and Inhabitants of the City of Rochelle, engaging to assist them to the utmost.—In the sirst Letter he says, My Fleet shall perish, rather than you shall not be relieved; in the Second, Be assured, I will never abandon you,

and

and that I will employ all the Force of my King-

dom for your Deliverance.

We have here, Mr. C——, another of your incontestable Facts, which, upon Examination, will appear to be as notorious a Falsehood, as perhaps was ever published or imposed upon the World.

That the King, in the Year 1625, lent the K. of France one Ship, the Vantguard (not a Squadron of Men of War as you tell us) and that he gave Leave, that fix or seven Merchant Ships might be hired (if the Owners were willing) to serve the French King in the Mediterranean Sea, is indeed true; and the only Foundation for all which you here advance in Prejudice to his Majesty's Character.

That his Majesty lent this Ship to be employed against the Rochellers, thereby to destroy at once all the remaining Strength of the Reformed in France, is absolutely false, as will be

shewn immediately.

That he wrote the abovementioned Letters to the Peers, Burghers, and Inhabitants of the City of Rochelle, a little BEFORE THIS EXPEDITION, is not only false, but what you yourself must know to be false. The Writer*, from whence you transcribe the Account, tells you the very Reverse. He tells you expressly, that the Parliament complained of this Misapplication of the English Ships in the Year 1625, and that the Letters, which you allude to, were not writ till May, 1628.

^{*} See Oldmixon's History, p. 81, and p. 100.

On the other hand you say, This Conduct appears by far the more wicked and assonishing, as the King, a little before (this vile Expedition) wrote two Letters, signed Charles Rex, to the Peers, Burghers, and Inhabitants of the City of Rochelle, engaging to assist them to the utmost.

After such a base Misrepresentation of a Fact of which you could not be ignorant, what is the Reader to think of that great Regard for Truth, which you talk fo much of? You promise us an impartial Recital of the most considerable Actions of his Majesty's Life (Page 3.) and (in Page 117.) you feriously and gravely observe, I am fully sensible of the Reasonableness and Justice of that ancient Maxim, De mortuis nil nisi bonum; bowever, this must not extend to History, wherein, for a just Recital of Facts, the true and full Characters of the principal Agents are often requisite; and the Historian Sould be under no manner of Restraint, but that only of keeping within the Bounds of Truth and Decency.

The above Account, Mr. C—de, is a notable Specimen of that great Impartiality, you here boast of. In order to blacken the Memory of an unfortunate Prince; in order to make him appear in a most wicked and odious Light, guilty of a notorious Breach of his Word, you not only misrepresent Matters of Fact, but invert the Order of them, and in Effect date his Majesty's Letters full two Years and upwards

before they were written.

Was

Was a Person in Trade, Mr. C——de, to act in such a Manner, was he to alter the Dates of Letters, to the Prejudice of his Correspondents, is it possible his Reputation could survive such a Behaviour a Moment after it was discovered? No, Sir, you are sensible, that he must sink immediately into the lowest Degree of Contempt and Disgrace; and if such a one should meet with more Credit in the Literary World, I verily think he would have better Luck than he deserves.

A Person who is a reputed Lyar, who neither hath nor pretends to have any great Regard for Truth or Integrity, is easily guarded against. But a Writer who professes the highest Veneration for Religion, for Honour, for Truth, for Justice, for Charity, &c. and yet knowingly and wilfully publishes the most barefaced and injurious Falsehoods, is something for which our Language wants a Name, and which Decency forbids me to describe.

But to proceed: Your Account of the Rochel Affair is fraught with so much political Malignity, that it will be necessary to take out the Sting, and discharge the Venom of it entirely. That therefore I may at least disabuse your Readers in this Particular, and give them a still clearer Notion of your boasted Virtue and Ingenuity, I shall beg Leave to lay before them a short Account of this Piece of our English History.

In the Year 1647, Feb. 15, a Pamphlet was published, intituled, A Declaration of the Com-

E

mons affembled in Parliament, &c. This Declaration has furnished almost all the Writers, who have been Enemies to kingly Government, with that Heap of Scandal, with which they have loaded the Memory of K. Charles the First ever fince.

Amongst other Reslections upon the King, it is here suggested, that his Majesty had permitted divers of the Navy Royal and other Merchantships to be employed against those, whom he was engaged to have affisted, and that hereby Rochel was betrayed. This Pamphlet was answered by Sir Edward Hyde (afterwards Earl of Clarendon) and fully proved to be an infamous and traiterous Libel on his Majesty. The Account which his Lordship has given of the Affair of Rochel is clear and satisfactory, for which Reason I shall take the Liberty to transcribe it.

"Though the Age, Quality, and Education, "of most of those who consented to this Decla-

ration, will not admit a Supposition, that they knew much of the Transaction of this Matter,

yet there are some amongst them who might

well have remembered, that there was only

one Ship of the Navy Royal (the Vantguard) lent by his Majesty to the French King, and

that the same was returned long before Ro-

" chel was besieged, and near, if not full,

two Years before it was furrendered; and

" therefore it would not be very eafy to prove,

that it was loft (much less betrayed) by that

- " Action; or that the Ships were employed " against

" against those, whom his Majesty was engaged

" to have affisted. "But because much unskilful Discourse hath been of this Argument to the Prejudice of the " King; and many well-meaning People have been too credulous in it, without confidering " that Actions of that Nature between great " Princes, are grounded upon deep Reasons of State, above the Apprehension of vulgar Un-" derstandings; and that the King, upon this " new Alliance, having at the same time a War " with Spain, had great Reason to gratify France " in all Offices of Friendship; it may be worth " the Labour briefly to fet down the Truth of " that Matter, and the Proceedings thereupon. " About the Time of his Majesty's Marriage " with the Queen, the French King had many " Defigns upon Italy, and a particular Differ-" ence and Contest with the States of Genoa, and " upon Conclusion of that Treaty, and renew-" ing the ancient League and Amity, confirmed " and strengthened by this Marriage, his Ma-" jesty was content to lend the Vantguard, and " to give Licence, that fix or feven Merchant-" ships might be hired (if the Owners were " willing) to serve the French King in the Me-" diterranean Sea, and upon a precise Promise, " that they should not be employed against those " of the Religion in France. Accordingly the " Vantguard (and no other Vessel of the Navy " Royal) was delivered, and the Merchant-ships " likewise, hired by the French Agents, with

"the full Consent of the Owners, one of which
E 2 " (or

(or one by their Nomination) commanded " each Ship, and carried the fame into France, and there themselves delivered the Ships into " the Possession of the French.

" After these Ships were thus engaged in the " French Service, and joined to their Fleet (in " which were twenty Ships of War likewise, " borrowed of the Hollanders, commanded by " Hauthaine the Admiral, and Dorpe his Vice-" Admiral, who, it is very probable, nor their " Masters, were privy or consenting to that En-" terprize, and with which they were much fu-" perior to those of the Religion, though the " English Ships had been away) they fell upon " the Rochel Fleet, and took and destroyed ma-" ny of them. The King was no fooner in-" formed of this, than he highly refented it by " his Ambaffador, and the French King excused " it upon those of the Religion, who, he alledg-" ed, had without Cause broken the Peace; the " Duke of Subefe having, when all was quiet, " feized all the French Ships at Blauet, which

very Ships made the best Part of the Fleet he " had now encountered and broken; and that " the King of England ought to be sensible of " the Injury, the Peace, thus broken, having " been made and confented to by the French

"King, upon his Majesty's earnest Mediation and Interpolition.

" Notwithstanding which his Majesty, justly in incenfed, that his Ships should be employed contrary to his Pleasure, and the Promise made to him, immediately required the Re-70 -

" flitution

" stitution of his, and all the English Ships, the " which was no fooner made, than, to publish " to the World how much he was displeased " with that Action, he entered into Hostility " with France, the chief Ground of that Quar-" rel being, that the English Ships had been " employed against those of the Religion, con-" trary to the express Promise made, that they " should not be used against them, as appears as " well by the Manifesto of the Duke of Bucking-" bam, dated July 21, and printed fince this " Parliament, as by the Records of State of " that Time. Let the World now judge with " what Colour the Loss of Rochel (which, as is " faid before, happened not till near, or full two Years after, the Return of the English " Ships) can be imputed to the King."

You have here, Mr. C——de, an Account of the Rochelle Expedition, from a Person who knew it perhaps as well as any one Man in Europe; and who not only relates it with such Circumstances, but appeals to such Records for the Truth of his

Account, as makes it unquestionable.

From other Writers it appears, that K. Charles was so incensed at the French King's employing the English Ships against the Rochellers, that no Ties of Friendship or Alliance could prevent a

Rupture between them.

That the King declared War against France chiefly upon that Account; that he was so intent upon carrying it on and relieving the Rochellers, that he mortgaged his own Lands for E 3 120,0001.

120,000 l. and borrowed 30,000 l. more of the East India Company for the same Purpose.

That accordingly a Fleet of a hundred Sail of Ships, and fix or feven thousand Land Forces, were sent to the Relief of Rochelle, and that when they appeared before the Town, they made the Inhabitants an Offer of their Affiftance.

That the Inhabitants (to their great Surprize) refused to admit them into the Town, till they had confulted the rest of the Protestants, with

whom they were united.

That from this Time the King was never in a Capacity of affifting them, and consequently that they themselves, by refusing to admit the English into the Town, were the chief Cause of their own Ruin.

The French and English Historians of Credit, Mr. C-de, are full to this Purpose; they having expresly told us, that Want of Union amongst the French Protestants was the princi-

pal Cause of their Ruin.

Now after fach a plain and incontestable Account of this Affair, what must the Reader think of your Relation of it, wherein there is scarce a fingle Particular, but what is either absolutely false or unfairly represented? What must he think of you, when you tell us, that the King strictly enjoined Captain Pennington, that in Case his Ships should refuse to join the French in this vile Expedition, he should even fink them; be should destroy the English, his own People, if they would not destroy the French Protestants?

That

That Captain Pennington had Orders to join the French Fleet is allowed; but does it follow from hence, that he was ordered to join the French against the Rochellers? That he was ordered to sink, to destroy the English if they would not destroy the French Protestants? Base Misrepresentation! On the other hand, 'tis clear that the express Condition upon which the Ships were lent, was, that they should not be employed against the Protestants in France; and that the chief Ground of the War which ensued, was because the Ships had been employed against them, contrary to the express Promise of the French King in that Respect.

But not to dwell longer upon so plain and evident a Case, after the foregoing Remarks, what must the candid Reader think of your principal Authorities, your Ludlows and your Oldmixons? What must be think of General Ludlow's plain Remark upon this Affair, which

you are so fond of reciting?

eber v.

The strong Town of Rochelle, says this Writer, wherein the Security of the Protestants of France chiefly consisted, by this Treachery was delivered up to the Papists; and those of the reformed Religion in all Parts of the Kingdom exposed to the Rage of their cruel and bloody Enemies. But how can this Account be possibly true? How could his Majesty, by furnishing the French King with some Ships in the Year 1625, betray the strong Town of Rochelle, which was not besieged, at least not surrender'd, till full two Years after those Ships were returned? In a word, what

what could the K. of England have done more for the Preservation of the Rochellers than he did? He entered into an expensive War to serve them; he sent Forces to their Relief, and they resuled to admit them into the Town; and if by this Means they put it out of his Majesty's Power to give them any further Assistance, why is the King to be charged with betraying and ru-

ining them?

I observed before, Mr, G——de, that Writers who were engaged in the Rebellion, and immediately concerned in the Murder of the King, were manifestly Parties, and cannot be deemed either proper Evidences or proper Judges in the Cause. General Ludlow, it is well known, was an utter Enemy to all kingly Government, and went the utmost Lengths with the most desperate and abandoned Rebels and Regicides. He sat in Judgment upon his Sovereign, and confented to the infamous Sentence which was passed upon him. This last Part of his Conduct, I think, Mr. C——de, you yourself allow to be base, cruel, and detestable *.

But if your Author could be capable of such a base, cruel, and detestable Act, is it conceivable that he would scruple to affert an Untruth in order to justify it? Is it conceivable that he would scruple to charge his Majesty with Trea-

[&]quot;They abused, says Mr. C—de, that Power they found they had, both in the Army and the House of Commons, to execute the BASE Design they had formed against the King's Life," p. 63. "The King, says Mr. C—de, had bard and cruel Usage;" And again, you say, 'you detest the Murder of the King;" so do I altogether as much. (p. 64).

chery, in order to excuse his own rebellious and traiterous Behaviour? Or is the bare Suggestion of such a Writer sufficient to confront the Authority of the most authentick Histories and Records? It is to no Purpose to tell us, that be was a Gentleman of Quality, Experience, and Conduct; that he commanded Armies, fought Battles, and governed the Kingdom of Ireland. It is to no Purpose to tell us, that be was an University Scholar; that he was a Man of better Family and Fortune than Clarendon that be was Knight of the Shire for the County of Wilts, when the other was only a Member for Wotton-Baffet; it is to no Purpose to amuse your Readers in fuch an idle, trifling Manner; Mr. Oldmixon has faid the very fame Things before you. The Question is not whether he was a Gentleman, or an Univerfity Scholar, or a Soldier, or a Member of Parliament. The Question is, whether he is an Author to be credited with refpect to the Point in Debate, whether he can be deemed an unprejudiced Writer of the Life of K. Charles; whether a Person, who was immediately concerned in deffroying and murdering him, can be supposed to do Justice to his Character, or relate his Actions in a fair and impara fair and open Representation orannaM lair

You tell us, be was ever esteemed to have an instexible Regard for Truth and Justice. But how does this appear? The Parliament in the 12th of K. Charles the Second were of a very different Opinion; they were of Opinion, that he and the rest of the Regicides were wretched Men.

Men, desperately wicked, and bardened in their Impiety; Miscreants, who were as far from being true Protestants as they were from being true Subjects. And indeed, can a Person who was concerned in forming the base Design against the King's Life; who was guilty of Tyranny and a flagrant Breach of Trust; who was one of the Faction that murdered the King, that trampled upon the Constitution and violated the fundamental Lows of the Realm; can such a one, or can you yourself believe that such a one, could have bad an inflexible Regard for Truth and Justice? And yet, that this Author was guilty of all the Bafeness, Barbarity, and Injustice, which is here laid to his Charge, will appear from your own Words, which I shall therefore lay before the Reader, and submit the whole to his Judgment.

" Cromwell (fays Mr. C-de, p. 63.) and " a few more of the Army (one of whom, give me Leave to add, was Ludlow) " had now the " Majority in Parliament, and Court was made " to them accordingly. They abused that Power " which they found they had, both in the Army and in the House of Commons, to exe-" cute the base Design they had formed against " the King's Life. I have no Reserves, I love " a fair and open Representation of Things. I as can fee Wickedness, Tyranny, and a flagrant " Breach of Trust on both Sides. I will readily grant, that the King had hard and cruel Ufage, that he was murdered, that he was destroyed " by a Faction. The Constitution was now again " trampled upon; the Laws were violated:

" Tyranny

" Tyranny and a wicked military Force usurped

" their Room *."

5. Your next Charge is, that the King, almost as soon as he came to the Throne, openly declared his Encouragement of Popery. For a Proof of this Particular we are told, amongst other Things, that he granted a general Pardon to all Papists under Prosecution, not only as Papists but as Criminals; that he released twenty Priests from Goal; in short, that he dispensed with the Laws against Popery and Papists in an arbitrary manner.

This Prince (K. Charles) says Mr. C——de, fent a Declaration to the Lord Keeper for granting full Liberty and Toleration to all Papists, notwithstanding the extreme Rigour of the then Laws against them. Upon some of the Privy Counsel advising him against this illegal Step, he openly replied, That it was his Will those Laws should ALL stand discharged.

Here, Sir, if I have any Skill in Painting, your Colouring is exquisite. Your Copy much exceeds the Original of your Great Master Old-

mixon.

The Words of Mr. Oldmixon are these: His Majesty, in the Declaration which he sent the

Here we are told, the Constitution was trampled upon, and the Laws violated by the Regicides; and yet (p. 52.) says Mr. C—de, it must be said to his (Ludlow's) real Honour, that he never betrayed the Constitution, or deserted the Interest of his Country.

Again (p 32.) Oliver Cronwell and others, by whom the Conflitution was trampled upon and the Laws violated, are called true Englishmen. Such Inconsistencies, which are not uncommon in Mr. C—de's Letter, I must leave the Reader to reconcile. Lord Keepen for granting full Liberty of Conscience to Papists, notwithstanding the Rigor of the Laws, whether penal or pecuniary, said, It was his Will, they should stand discharged.

Where it is observable, his Majesty in the Declaration said it was his Will, &c. i. e. as I suppose, this was the Form of the Declaration; Our Will is, that the Laws against the Papists

Should fland discharged.

Mr. C—de, in order to make his Majesty appear as arbitrary and obstinate as possible, changes this Part of the Declaration into a Debate between his Majesty and some of the Privy Council, and roundly afferts, that his Majesty, in Opposition to the Advice of his Privy Council, declared openly, that it was his Will, those Laws should All stand discharged.

I should not have troubled the Reader with this Particular; but as you profess yourself to be a Lover of Truth, I could not well omit so notable an Instance of your inviolable Regard

for that focial Virtue.

I shall now proceed to an Examination of the Fact. You tell us, that K. Charles ordered that all the Laws against the Papists should

Rand discharged . worth both ad ne print

1.00

Now would not any one conclude from hence, that the Papists were exempted from the Penalties of all the Laws that had been made against them, that the King had granted them full Liberty and Toleration, and put them in some Measure upon a Level with the Rest of his Subjects?

That,

That therefore your Readers may be difabused with Regard to this Particular, I shall give them as good an Account of it, as I can collect from our best and most authentic Historians.

When K. Charles by Proxy was married at Paris, the Solemnity was performed with the utmost Pomp and Magnificence. Amongst other Honours and Instances of Regard which were paid to the new Alliance by the French King, Pardons were granted to several Criminals, and numerous other Prisoners were set at Liberty, and made Partakers of the general Joy and Satisfaction. When, therefore, the Queen arrived in England, is it not natural to suppose, that the King would endeavour to return the Compliment, and shew the highest Regard for a Princefs, who was given him in Marriage with fuch Testimonies of Esteem and Respect? Admitting therefore, that upon this extraordinary Occasion, Prosecutions against Papists were stopped, and that feveral Popish Delinquents were released out of Prison, does it follow from hence, that his Majesty openly encouraged Popery, and arbitrarily dispensed with all the Laws against Popery and Papists! And yet, as far as I can collect from our best Historians, the Declaration, that was fent to the Lord Keeper, which you so much complain of, and in which the King is faid to have dispensed with all the Laws against Papists, was nothing more, than a Pardon granted to a few Popith Delinquents, upon her Majesty's Arrival in England, and

an Order to set at Liberty some poor Debtors of the same Profession. As to the Laws against Papists, it is well known, they were still in Force, and accordingly, sometime in the same Year, viz. in the Year 1625, there was an Injunction from the Throne to put them severely in Execution.

However, it must be owned, that about this Time great Complaints were made of the Growth and Encrease of Popery, and perhaps not without Reason. The Sentiments of the Queen probably encouraged the Popish Party to propagate their Notions with more than ordinary Zeal and Industry. However, does it appear that his Majesty gave any Encouragement to fuch Practices? No; on the other hand, when a Petition was presented to him, complaining of the feveral Causes, which contributed to the Growth of Popery, he gave a full and fatisfactory Answer to every Article in the Petition, and readily consented, that proper Remedies should be applied for removing the Caufes complained of, as may be feen at large in Rushworth. Accordingly a Proclamation was published, to call home fuch Children as were educated in foreign Countries, and not only Warrants to difarm Recusants, but Orders were issued out by the Privy Council to put the Laws in Execution against Priests and Jesuits; and the Bishops were commanded to proceed against the Papists by Excommunication and other Cenfures. (Rushworth, tom, i. 194. 198.) with a of

In

Michael Amival in America, and

10.

In the Beginning of the Year 1626, the Privy Council required the Bishop of Durham to apprehend such of his Majesty's Subjects as should be present at Mass, and to commit them to Prison; and the King's Attorney was ordered to acquaint the Judges of the Circuits, that it was his Majesty's Pleasure, they should proceed with

Rigor against Recusants.

Rapin, indeed, feems to question, whether fuch Orders were punctually executed; and I own it is not unlikely, that the Queen used her utmost Endeavours to prevent them from being put in Execution with that Severity which was required. But does it follow from hence, that they were not executed at all? By no Means; on the other hand, it is certain, that the Law for difarming Recufants was put in force against feveral Gentlemen of the first Rank and Qua-The Marquis of Winchester and his Son; the Earl of Caftlehaven, Viscounts Montague and Colchester, the Lords Petre, Morley, Vaux, Eures, Arundel of Warder, Tenham, Herbert, and Windfor, are particularly mentioned by Rusbworth, tom. i. p. 194. And some People were of Opinion, that the Proceedings against the Papists in this Reign were very severe. The Saying of a Member of the House of Commons upon the Occasion is remarkable. He observed, that there were many Ginns and Snares let for the Papists, but not one Mouse-trap for the Puritans.

Thus, Mr. C—de, stood the Laws against Popery and Papists in the Years 1625 and 1626.

Now,

Now, whether upon the whole his Majesty, during this Part of his Reign, can be justly charged with encouraging Popery, or dispensing with the Laws against Papists in an arbitrary Manner, must be left to the Reader to judge.

In the Year 1627, the Servants of the Queen grew extremely infolent and troublesome. Their Behaviour had not only alienated the Affections of several of his Majesty's Subjects, but embarraffed the Public Affairs, and given great Encouragement to the Romish Party. The King therefore resolved upon an Expedient, which, perhaps, was as prudent as could be thought of upon fuch an Emergency. In order to prevent their doing any further Mischief in Church or State, he dismissed about a Hundred and Twenty of them, and ordered them to depart the Kingdom. Their Dismission was resented by the French King, as a Breach of the Marriage Articles, and a great Indignity offered a Daughter of France. But the Resentment of the French Court had no Weight with his Majesty, when the Good of his People, and the Interest of the established Religion were concerned. He was fensible, that they had created great Uneafiness not only between bim and his Queen, but between bim and his Pcople; and that their Residence at Court had made them infolent and bufy in propagating their superstitious Notions amongst his People. He resolved therefore, that they should depart the Kingdom; nor could the Resentment of his Queen, or the Difpleafure and Papillia the Years it

pleasure of her Brother, divert him from his Purpose.

The Behaviour of his Majesty in this Particular, you must allow, Mr. C-de, was very different from what you are pleased to represent it. He gave no Countenance (it is plain) even to Papists, who were the particular Favourites of his Queen; but expelled them his Court and his Kingdom, and rather chose to hazard a Rupture with France, than be subject to the Inconveniences of their mischievous Tenets and Intrigues.

I could mention several other Reasons, which must fully convince the candid Reader, that his Majesty was so far from encouraging Popery, that he had an utter Aversion to the Superstition and Idolatry of that corrupt Profession *, and

* See Lord Clarendon's History, vol. i. Fol. p. 63; and Fleetwood's Sermon on January 30, 1709-10, p. 22. 800.

Bishop Fleet-wood (in his Sermon preached before the Lords, Jan. 30, 1709-10, page 22. 8-vo.) gives the following Account

of his Majesty's Religion: " No Prince, I will fay, no private Gentlemen, did ever un-" derstand the Constitution of our Church better, defend it with " stronger Arguments, adhere to it with more Judgment, adorn " it with better Manners, live up to its good Principles with " more Virtue, nor, in Performance of its Offices, shew more " devout and exemplary good Behaviour; I will not in these " Things except the Queen upon the Throne, nor the Bleffed " Saint in Heaven, her Sister No Person did ever shew more " Countenance and Credit to its Discipline and Orders: And

" must I say, no Prince but he did ever die in its Defence, to

" justify the high Esteem we have him in."

The Testimonies of Presbyterians and Republicans.

LILLY the Republican, speaking of K Charles, says, he was no Papist, nor favoured any of their Tenets. (Lilly's Tract, intituled, Monarchy no Monarchy, printed, 1651, page 83.) lived lived and died a fincere Member of the Church of England.

Bishop Kennet tells us, that Mr. Alexander Henderson, upon his Death-bed, amongst other Things, made the following Declaration:

I profess, that I was oftentimes astonished with the Solidity " and Quickness of his (K. Charles's) Reasoning and Replies, and wondered how He, spending his Time in Sports and Re-" creations, could have attained to fo great a Knowledge: And " must confess ingenuously, that I was convinced in Conscience, " and knew not how to give him any reasonable Satisfaction; "Yet the Sweetness of his Disposition is such, that whatever I " faid was well taken. I must say, that I never met with any " Disputant of that mild and calm Temper; which convinced " me the more, and made me think, that fuch Wisdom and " Moderation could not be without an extraordinary Measure of " Divine Grace. I have heard much of his Carriage towards " the Priests in Spain; and that King James told the Duke of " Buckingham, upon his going thither, That he durst venture his " Son Charles with all the Jesuits in the World, he knew him to be " so well grounded in the Protestant Religion; but could never be-" lieve it before, &c. (Kennet's Hist. of England, vol. iii. p. 174.) The Truth and Genuineness of this Declaration of Mr. Alexander Henderson is proved and confirmed beyond all Possibility of a Reply. In a Letter of Mr. John Sage's, the learned Author of the Principles of the Cyprianic Age, are the following

Words: " Mr. Robert Freebairn, Archdeacon of Dumblain, and Mi-" nister of Gask and Strathern, a Person of great Worth and In-" tegrity, gave me this following Account: That while Mr. " Henderson was in his Decay, of which he died, Mr. John " Freebairn, Father of this Mr. Robert, and one Mr. Rue and " another Minister (whose Name I have forgot) went together " to visit him. He, the said Mr. Robert, who was then a " Preacher, went along with them; after fome Things had " passed in Discourse, one of the Ministers addressed himself to "Mr. Henderson to this Purpose; that now in all likelihood he " was dying, that he had been very much concerned in the pub-" lick Commotions, which for some Years before had happened " in Scotland; that his Testimony after his Death would be of " great Weight with all those that were zealous for the Cause, &c. that, therefore, it was very proper, that he should lay " himself open to those that were then present, that they might " be in a Condition to encourage their Brethren, &c. To which

To

To omit other Proofs, the folern Protestation which he made at the Head of his Army be-

" Mr. Henderson composedly and deliberately replied to this " Purpose. That he had been very active in overturning Episco-" pacy and encouraging Rebellion; but he took God to Witness, " that he proposed nothing to himself, when he began, but the " Security of Religion and the Kirk, in Opposition to Popery, " which he was made to believe, was at the Bottom of the King's Defigns: But now he was fenfible, that his Fears were " groundless: He had Opportunities of conversing freely with " the King, and he was well fatisfied, that he was as fincere a " Protestant as any in his Dominions; he was heartily forry, and "humbly begged God's Pardon for it, that he had been fo forward in a Course so unjustifiable; that, if it should please "God to reftore him to Health and Strength, he would go no " further on in that Course, and he was heartily afraid, that they " had all gone too far already. Nothing was fo proper for " them as to retract, and return to their Duty to his Majesty, " who was the learnedst, the most religious, and every way the best " King, that ever did fit upon a Throne in Britain. This his Difcourse so surprized them, that they for some time sat filent; at " length one of them (I think it was Mr. Rue) bespake the " Rest of them after this Manner. Brethren, this our Brother is in a high Fever, and Raving; you ought not to heed what he fays. No, fays Mr. Henderson, I am very weak indeed, but " am not at all raving, bleffed be God, who, for his infinite " Mercy, allows the Use of my Reason in this my low Estate, in "which I have as much as ever; I hope I have spoken no " Incoherences, and what I have faid, I will fay over again. "Then he refumed what he had faid, and enlarged upon it, and " defired them in the Name of God to believe what he spoke was " from his Heart, and with the Sincerity and Seriousness, which be-" came a dying Person. After they had taken their Leave, the "three Ministers enjoined Mr. Robert Freebairn a profound " Silence of what he had heard, discharging him to communi-" cate it to any Person whatsoever, and they added Threatnings " also totheir Prohibition. But he (as he told me himself) bold-" ly told them, that he thought himself bound in Conscience to " declare what he had heard, as he had Occasion, God's Glory " required it, and it was Mr. Henderson's Purpose, that it shall " be propaled and propagated. This Account I had oftener " than once from Mr. Freebairn's own Mouth. He died about " 21 or 22 Years ago, aged about 70. Iam, Sir, Yours, JOHN SAGE.

efoer ka

F 2

tween

between Stafford and Wallington +.

The Satisfaction he gave several of the Nobility and Gentry at Oxford, just before he received the blessed Sacrament *:

" The Prefby-The next Evidence I shall produce is Rapin. " terians, says he, were possessed, that a Project was formed to " re-establish the Romish Religion in England. - For my part, " fays Rapin, I verily believe, neither the King, nor the Archbi-" shop, nor the Ministers, for the most part, ever formed such a " Design. At least, in all that has been faid upon this Subject, " I have not met with any Proof which appeared, I will not fay sufficient to convince me, but even to have the least Probability. " Nevertheless, it is certain, this Opinion was spread amongst " the People, and the Presbyterians used all their Endeavours to " gain it Belief. I do not know whether they believed it themfelves, " or only thought it for their Advantage to cast this Reproach " upon the Church of England, in order to strengthen their Party, " in which they succeeded at last beyond their Expectations." Rapin's Hift. of England, Vol. II. p. 200.

Again, p. 571. "Some accuse him (the King) says he, of an Inclination for the Roman catholick Religion: Nay, there are who carry this Charge so far as to say, he intended to restore

" it in England. These Imputations are groundless."

Now after all this, what must we think of that Heap of incoherent, inconclusive Stuff, which a late Writer (the Author of An Essay towards attaining a true Idea of K. Charles's Character) has raked together, chiefly from this very Historian (Rapin) to prove, that K. Charles savoured Popery, and laboured a Coalition with the Church of Rome? Rapin himself, it is plain, never thought that the King had any such Design, or that any such thing could fairly be concluded, either from his general Character, or from any particular Action of his Life. But the Author of the Essay, it seems, knows Rapin's Meaning better than himself, and would fain (Chap. ix.) make him say what he repeatedly disavows. Accordingly, he has quoted no less than twelve or thirteen Passages from him in Proof of the above Charge, which Rapin himself expressly declares to be groundless, and not in the least probable.

I have not room in this Place to examine what this Author of the Essay, &c. has said upon the Occasion, and therefore must defer it. In the mean time, as he has been pleased to charge K. James as well as K. Charles with favouring Popery, I will beg leave to refer the Reader to Dr. Grey's Examination of Mr. Neal's History of the Puritans, Vol. II. 1 ages, 12, 13, 14, 15. pages 70, 71. and pages 80, 81. and when he has read,

The

The great Regard he always shewed to the established Church, by his constant Attendance upon the publick Worship:

K. James's Speech to the Lords and Commons at Whitehall, March 21, 1609;

His first Speech to bis Parliament the 19th of March 1603;

The Attempt of the Papists to set aside the King's Succession to the Crown of England about the Year 1601, &c.

Rushworth's Account of what the King Said upon Settling the Ar-

ticles of the intended Spanish Match;

The Account which the same Author has given of K. Charles's Protestant Principles;

Together with K. Charles's Letter to Olivarez upon the same Sub-

ject; and

Bishop Hacker's Relation of his Majesty's Behaviour in Spain; When the Reader has perused these several Particulars, I will leave him to judge whether there is the least Foundation for what the Author of the Essay has suggested in Prejudice to their Majesties Protestant Principles; or whether the Proofs in his 9th Chapter, can possibly be deemed sufficient to counterbalance those incontestable Facts and Authorities, which I have either here referred him to, or transcribed for his Perusal.

† His Majesty's Protestation at the Head of his Army between

Stafford and Wallington, Sept. 19, 1642.

"I do promise in the Presence of Almighty God, and as I hope for his Blessing and Protection, that I will to the utmost of my Power defend and maintain the true reformed Protestant Religion established in the Church of England, and by the Grace of God in the same will live and dye, &c.

* His Majesty's Speech before his receiving the Holy Sacrament from the Hand of Archbishop Usber, at Christ Church in

Oxford, 1643.

"My Lord, I espy here many resolved Protestants who may declare to the World the Resolution, I do now make. I have, to the utmost of my Power, prepared my Soul to become a worthy Receiver, and may I so receive Comfort by the blessed Sacrament, as I do intend the Establishment of the true resormed Religion, as it stood in its Beauty in the happy Days of Queen Elizabeth, without any Connivance at Popery. I bless God that in the midst of these publick Distractions, I have still Liberty to communicate; and may this Sacrament be my Damnation, if my Heart do not join with my Lips in

" this Protestation."

The several Testimonies of Writers of unquechionable Credit and Authority to the same Pur-

pose *: And lastly,

The Testimony which he himself gave of his religious Sentiments upon the Scassold, and which he sealed with his Blood, are too good Proofs of his Majesty's Integrity in this Respect to be disputed. Some of his last Words were,

In his Majesty's Letter to his Son, the Prince of Wales, June

2, 1646, from Newcastle, are these Words:

"I having wrote fully to your Mother, what I would have "you to do, whom I command you to obey, in every thing, "except in Religion.

• I shall here transcribe the Testimonies of Enemies as well as Friends, of Churchmen, Presbyterians and Republicans.

The Testimonies of Churchmen.

"The King, fay Lord Clarendon, was always the most punc-" tual Observer of Decency in Devotion, and the strictest Pro-" moter of the Ceremonies of the Church, as believing in his " Soul, the Church of England to be inflituted the nearest the " Practice of the Apostles, and the best for the Propagation and " the Practice of Religion, of any Church in the World. On " the other fide, though no Man was more averse from the Romish " Church, than he was, nor better understood the Motives of " their Separation from us and Animosity against us, he had " the highest Dislike to that Part of his Subjects, who were " against the Government of the Church established, and did always look upon them as a dangerous and feditious People, " who under Pretence of Conscience, which kept them from " fubmitting to the spiritual Jurisdiction, to take the first Op-" portunity they could find or make, to withdraw themselves from their temporal Subjection." Lord Clar. Hist. Vol. I. p. 8. 8vo. Ed.

Bishop Burnet says He (K. Charles) bad a firm Aversion to Po-

pery. Hift. of his own Times, p. 47.

Dr. Welwood, in his Memoirs, says, As to his Religion, he was a Protestant, in the strictest Sense, of the Church of England, and for the divine Right of Episcopacy. Memoirs, p. 18.

I die a Christian, according to the Profession of

But perhaps you mean, Mr. C. de, that his Majesty was no Friend to Puritanism. If this be your Meaning you are certainly in the right *; but does it follow from hence that he was a Papist, or inclined to Popery? No, Sir, his Majesty was neither a Puritan nor Papist. He was, what he professed himself to be, a fincere Member of the Church of England upon Principle. He understood, and could defend her Doctrine, Discipline, and Government, as well as most Clergymen in his Dominions; and I verily believe, his Notion of Puritanism and Popery was, in one Respect, pretty much alike, He well knew that both were irreconcileable with the Principles and Practice of the Christian World, in the first and purest Ages of the Church; and, till some Writers are more successful in proving an Affinity between Puritanism and primitive Christianity, you will find, Mr. C-de, that the Generality of fensible People in this Kingdom will be of Opinion, that a Man may be a very good Protestant, without being either a Puritan or an Independent, a Prefbyterian or Republican.

I shall only trouble you with a Word or two more upon this Head. I freely own, that his Majesty seems to have had a very great personal Regard for feveral of his Roman-catholic Subjects; and the Reason for it was plain. He had by long Experience found them to be Gentle-

^{*} See Clarendon's Hift. Vol. I. Fol. p. 63.

men of Probity and Honour, faithful to his Perfon and Civil Government. He had found them ready to affift him in his Necessities; and for this Reason he not only treated them with Tenderness, but at last reposed a Considence in them. He admitted several of them into the Army, who behaved with Courage and Fidelity*. But does it follow from hence that he savoured their Religion? Or was he to blame for treating them with Civility, when he found them so sincerely attached to his Interest?

It is granted, that his Majesty must know them to be utter Enemies to the established Church: he must be sensible, that they would think themselves obliged to overturn it, whenever they had an Opportunity for that Purpose. And for this Reason, perhaps, it may be thought imprudent that his Majesty should employ them in his Army. But have you never heard, Mr. C-de, that certain Protestants, bitter Enemies to the established Religion, have been countenanced and encouraged in the same Manner by other Princes? Have you never heard, that upon Affurances given of their Attachment to the Civil Conflitution, and upon one fingle Compliance with the national Form of receiving the Sacrament, they have been put in Authority, and employed in Offices of great Trust and Importance? Have you never heard that they have been advanced in the Army and at the Bar, and

^{*} See Dr. Grey's Examination of Mr. Neal's History, p 366, &c. Vol. II.

honoured with the highest Marks of regal Favour?

It is to little Purpose, Mr. C——de, to tell us, that these Gentlemen were Protestants; the Question is, whether they were not professed Enemies to the established Church; nay, whether they were not as great Enemies to its Government and Worship, as any Roman-catholic whatfoever. It is certain that they have once overturned and trampled upon the Constitution in Church and State; and if it should again be in their Power, what Reason can be given, why they should not again play over their old Game?

But admitting that they were fincere Friends to the Civil Establishment; yet still give me Leave to tell you, that this is but Part of our Constitution. Our Constitution consists of a Civil and Religious Establishment, which our Kings folemnly fwear to protect and support. Now if certain Protestant Gentlemen, professed Enemies to our religious Establishment, have been countenanced and encouraged; if their Attachment to the Civil Constitution has been sufficient to recommend them to the Favour, the Protection, and Confidence of other Princes, how comes it to be so very criminal in K. Charles, to take into his Service a few Roman-catholic Gentlemen, who pleaded the very same Pretenfions to Favour and Indulgence? who gave his Majesty the strongest Assurance of their Zeal for his Person and Civil Government?

K. Charles, it is well known, did not employ them in his Service out of Choice, but out of meer Necessity. He would not suffer them to serve in his Army, till one of their Chiefs had received a Commission from the Rebels, and they were permitted to serve in the Rebel Army. This appears from Accounts of unquestionable Authority. In the Year 1642, August 10, the King issued out a Proclamation, the Title of which is as follows *: By the King, a Proclamation, declaring his Majesty's express Command, That no popish Recusant, nor any other, who shall resuse to take the two Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, shall serve in his Army.

And when the King was at last prevailed upon to accept of their Service, Lord Castlemain, a Person of undoubted Honour and Integrity, tells you the Reason of it. This noble Author informs us †, "That Sir Arthur Aston, a Ca-"tholic of Quality and Experience, offered our late Sovereign his Service, and the Service of many more, upon the first Preparations of War. The good Prince sincerely gave him Thanks, but told him, that by Reason of

" the Army; for the Rebels, who never omit-" ted a Pretence, would make use of this to dis-

" their Religion he durst not admit them into

" credit him among the People. This Knight being refused thus, rode in all Haste to Lon-

" don, and made the like Tender to Effex. The

Earl, upon the Proposal, consults the Cabal,

" who presently advised him to accept the Of-

" fer;

^{*} Hustand's exact Collections, 4to. p. 510. † A Preface to the Reply to the Answer of the Catholic Apology, printed 1668, p. 16.

fer; and so a formal Commission was given Sir Arthur. He immediately posted back to

the Court, and there shewed the Commission

" to his Majesty; which when he saw, and together with it the Intrigue of these Juglers,

" he not only gave Sir Arthur a Commission,

" but from that Time declared all Catholics

" welcome; who thereupon, from every Quar-

" ter, haftened to his Help and Succour."

From this Account, Mr. C——de, it appears, that Papists were welcome to serve in the Rebel Army as well as the King's; and yet, I presume, you will scarce allow us to conclude from hence that the Rebels were Papists; and why then must this be a Reason for charging the King with favouring Popery? Upon the whole, if the Evidence already produced, in Favour of his Majesty's Protestant Principles, be not sufficient, I would fain know what can possibly be sufficient for that Purpose.

Historians, and other Writers of unquestionable Authority, declare him to have been a good Protestant. He himself at the Altar, and upon other Occasions, made the most solemn Protestations to the same Effect. He attended upon the Service of the Church of England with great Marks of Devotion all his Life-time, and at his Death declared himself a sincere Member of that Church in which he had lived. And yet this Prince, almost as soon as he came to the Throne (if we will take Mr. C——de's Word for it) openly declared his Encouragement of Popery. Credat Judaus Apella.

6. Your

76]

6. Your next Charge against the King is, that he was guilty of very illegal and arbitrary Steps, in apprehending a great Number of leading Men of both Houses of Parliament.

To this, and fome other Particulars, you shall receive an Answer in my next, which I hope to

wood bas of the of the order of the

be able to fend you by the first Post.

I am, Sir, Yours, etc.

Hatton Garden, April, 1748.

the Monarce already produced, in Farger of his The End of the SECOND LETTER. I would him know what can possibly be fulli-

After any and other liviters of unquestionbood a road symbol mild endow belong a stidle Proteiner, the Manage at the officer and twen

Gons as the fittie brieft, wife attenday then the Sevice of the State of England with accept and to be a presented and the occupy of the editality.

ther Consult in with the had lived and ver this trace, alread as jobras he common in-

All of the state of the state.

cient for that Parton, attended

you will sparke allow us so conclude from hence what the Robelt were Publikes and why other most that he a Person that character the King with securities Pleas ? Upon the whole, if

the Tarbert be made on, eight or weary.

of the policy of the control of the

Perc War Queen to voor Andron to the

SIR,

YOUR next Charge against the King is, that he was guilty of very illegal and arbitrary Steps, in apprehending a great Number of leading Men of both Houses of Parliament; that Sir Dudly Diggs was hurried away to the Tower, under Pretence of undutiful Speech; and that Sir John Elliot, another famous Speaker in the House of Commons, was committed close Prisoner, with many others, contrary to the repeated Petitions and Remonstrances of the House

of Lords and House of Commons.

As to Sir Dudly Diggs, you tell us, that this Gentleman protested with the utmost Solemnity, that he never spoke the Words he was charged with, and that no such Words ever came into his Thoughts; and what is more, thirty-six of the Lords, who stood close by him at the Time of the said Conference, entered into a voluntary Protestation, subscribing their Names to it; viz. that Sir Dudly Diggs did not speak these Words, nor any Words that did or might trench on the King's Honour; that notwithstanding this Publick Attestation of his Innocence by so many Peers, to

the Tower he must go, right or wrong. Inno-

cence in those Days was no Security.

This, Mr. C——de, is your Account of the Commitment of Sir Dudly Diggs; and would not any one conclude from hence, that the Commitment of this Gentleman was subsequent to the Protestation of the Lords? That the King in an obstinate and arbitrary Manner ordered him to the Tower, notwithstanding this publick Attestation of his Innocence by so many Peers?—And yet the very Reverse of this is true.

Sir Dudly Diggs was committed to the Tower either on the 8th or 9th Day of May, 1626; and the Protestation of the Lords was not made till two or three Days afterwards. The King had been informed, that this Gentleman and Sir John Elliot had exceeded their Commission in their Speeches against the Duke of Buckingbam, and mentioned the Remedies applied and given to King James during his last Sickness in Terms injurious to his Majesty. The same or the next Day therefore they were, by the King's Order, fent to the Tower. On the Eleventh, thirty-fix of the Lords, who were present at the Conference, when the Impeachment against the Duke was presented, attested under their Hands, that they did not hear Sir Dudly Diggs speak the Words, with which he was charged. The King, upon this Attestation, was satisfied, and released the two Members. So that the King was fo far from committing them, or continuing their Commitment, after the Protestation of so many Peers (as you are pleased to represent the

the Case) that he paid a very great Regard to the Protestation of the Lords, and, upon an Ap+ plication from the Commons, caused the two imprisoned Members to be released. As this is a true State of the Case, why, Mr. C-de, would you represent it in such an invidious Light? If K. Charles was that weak Bigot, that lawless, arbitrary Tyrant, which you fay he was, what Occasion for having Recourse to little mean Methods, in order to make him fuch? What Occasion for inverting the Order of Things, for disquising Circumstances, for confounding the Dates of Facts, and taking fuch visible Pains to give an ill-natured Turn to his Majesty's Actions? But a Lover of Truth and Peace, it seems, is the Title you affume, and by this Time the Reader, I fancy, is thoroughly convinced, how well you deserve it.

But still, it may be objected, That the Imprifonment of the abovenamed Gentlemen was illegal, and an arbitrary Infringement upon the Privi-

leges of the House of Commons.

It may be so; and the King may possibly have been mistaken, with Respect to the Extent of his Prerogative; or, which is more likely, the Behaviour of the two supposed Delinquents was perhaps misrepresented to his Majesty. They were possibly not guilty of the undutiful Speech, with which they were charged; and, if the King was made sensible of his Mistake, and endeavoured to redress the Gentlemen by immediately releasing them, where was the mighty Crime? Where was the great Stretch of Power

in his Majesty? And yet it seems, this is one of those high Crimes and Misdemeanors, one of those incontestable Facts, which are to argue for themselves, and prove his Majesty a lawless, arbi-

trary Tyrant.

How easy is it, Mr. C—de, by such Methods to prove the best of Princes a Tyrant? How easy to heighten inadvertent Actions? Actions which are the Result of Mistake or Misinformation, into oppressive Designs, into Schemes for absolute Rule and Tyranny? But though it be mighty easy, yet give me Leave to tell you, it is very barbarous to insult the Ashes of the unfortunate Prince, we are speaking of, in such a base and ungenerous Manner. You yourself allow, that he had hard and cruel Usage, and that he was murdered by a Faction; and is it not the Height of Cruelty to murder his good Name a-fresh? To aggravate Facts and swell the Charge against him by Misrepresentation?

Either he was the lawless, arbitrary Tyrant, you have made him, or he was not. If he was, what you say he was, you cannot think that the Usage he met with, was either hard or cruel. He suffered nothing, upon your own Principles, but what he deserved; it was no Matter what became of him. His Actions, if such as you represent them, "Were in the Opinion of every" old Whigg or consistent Protestant (the Cant"words of those Times for downright Re"publican) sufficient to justify every Thing that
"was a sted against him, his exectable Murder

" not

onot excepted." (Grey's Examination, vol. iii.

But if he was not that lawless, arbitrary Tyrant, if he did not deserve the Treatment he met with, it is not only base and barbarous, but absurd in you to represent him, as if he did.

But to return to your Charge. In the Year 1628-9 it seems, Sir John Elliot was again imprisoned and fined, with many others. The Day after the King had given Notice of the Dissolution of the Parliament, viz. March 3, 1628-9, Warrants were directed from the Privy Council, to apprehend several Members of Parliament, as Denzil Holles, Esq; Sir Miles Hobart, Sir Peter Hayman (Sir John Elliot omitted*) John Selden, Esq; Corington, Long, Stroude, Valen-

In the Year 1626, he was committed to the Tower for a most bitter and virulent Speech, in which he reslected upon the Administration, and particularly upon the Conduct of the D. of Buckingham. His Consinement was then of a very short Duration, he being set at Liberty within a few Days after his Commitment.

In the Year 1627 (if I mistake not) he was committed to the Gate-bouse for refusing to pay the Loan, and, in the Beginning of April, 1628, we find him again at Liberty, and in the House; he

tine

The artful Defign of this Omission is plain. Mr. C—de and others, who speak of this State-Martyr (as they call him) would fain make their Readers believe, that he was a very great Sufferer, and accordingly tell us, that after many Years Imprisonment, he funk and died under the Oppression. Now, would not any one conclude from hence, that he was a Prisoner for many Years successively, and that his Death was owing to the tedious and severe Nature of his Consinement? And yet it does not appear, that he lived much above three Years after his first Commitment, and during this Period, it is certain, that he was taken into Custody a second and a third Time; so that it is a Question, whether the Imprisonment, which is here called an Imprisonment of many Years, amounted to full two Years in the whole.

tine, and some others, all leading Men in the House of Commons. Most of them were apprebended and committed close Prisoners to the

Tower. (Page 12.)

Page 17. We are told further from Acherly, the famous Lawyer, that Sir John Elliot was condemned and fined 2000 l. Denzil Holles 1000 Marks, Valentine 500, and were imprisoned till they should pay the Fines; that their Imprisonment was accompanied with some arbitrary Severities; for that those Gentlemen were denied not only Pen, Ink, and Paper, but in their Sicknesses, their Wives were denied Admittance, insomuch that Sir John Elliot, after Many Years Imprisonment, sunk and DIED under the Oppression.

Here we find, as was faid before, Sir John Elliot again taken into Custody with several others; but for what, is not said. The Crimes

being one of those, who debated the King's Proposition for a

Supply.

He continued in the House all this Year, till he was again taken into Custody, March 1628-9, and, in the Year 1629, or some Time in the next Year, we are told, he died. But the Circumstances of his being committed a second and a third Time are industriously concealed, in order to make the Reader believe, that he continued a Prisoner from the Time of his first Commitment to his Death. When Mr. C-de is pleafed to tell us, that Warrants were directed from the Privy Council, March, 1628-9, to apprehend several Members of Parliament, as Denzil Holles, Efq; Sir Miles Hobart, Sir Peter Hayman, &c. Sir John Elliot's Name is omitted. Had his Commisment at this Time been mentioned, the Reader must have seen, that he could not possibly have been imprisoned so many Years, as Mr. C-de and others would infinuate. Such are the mean, the base Arts made use of to aggravate Matters, and fix upon his Majesty the Charge of cruel and arbitrary Proceedings.

of these Gentlemen are all industriously concealed, and the Reader is lest (for any thing, that you have told him) to conclude, that they were Men perfectly innocent and inosfensive, and their Imprisonment illegal, arbitrary, and oppressive. They were all leading Men, says Mr. C—de, in the House of Commons, and his Majesty was guilty of illegal and arbitrary Steps

in apprehending them.

But how does this appear? How does it appear, that his Majesty's Treatment of them was either illegal or arbitrary? They were indeed Members of the House of Commons, and consequently, privileged Persons; but will parliamentary Privilege justify Gentlemen in faying and doing what they please? In infulting their Sovereign? In excluding his Servants the Privilege of entering the House, and consequently. himself the Power of even proroguing or diffolying the Parliament? Will parliamentary Privilege justify Gentlemen in making a Beargarden of the House of Commons, in going together by the Ears, in affaulting and firiking each other, in forcibly and tumultuously detaining the Speaker in the Chair, and declaring, they would fit as long as they pleafed?

Will parliamentary Privilege justify Gentlemen in such Actions as these? Actions, which have a manifest Tendency to destroy all Order and Government, to undermine the Fundamentals of our Constitution, and throw every Thing into Consusion? Is it a Stretch of the Prerogative to secure and punish Persons, who are guilty of

G 2

fuch

fuch infolent, fuch undutiful, and feditious Be-

You tell us, indeed, or rather Mr. Oldmixon has told us, That the Imprisonment of those Gentlemen was contrary to the Opinion of the Judges, who declared, that such a violent Restraint on so many Members, was a publick Arrest on the whole Body of Parliament. What Authority Mr. Oldmixon had for this Assertion, I know not. This is certain, that immediately after the Commitment of the Gentlemen, his Majesty put, amongst others, the following Query to the Judges, viz. Whether a Parliament Man, committing an Offence against the King or Council, not in a Parliament Way, might, after the Parliament ended, be punished, or not?

To which all the Judges unanimously replied, He might, if he be not punished for it in " Parliament: For the Parliament shall not give " Privilege to any contra morem Parliamenta-" rium, to exceed the Bounds and Limits of his " Place and Duty. And all agreed, that reguarly he cannot be compelled out of Parliament to answer Things done in Parliament in a parliamentary Course: But it is otherwise, where Things are done exorbitantly, " for those are not the Acts of a Court."-Whether this is declaring, that such a violent Restraint on so many Members was a publick Arrest on the whole Body of Parliament, let the Reader judge. But But as the Extent of the Prerogative, Mr. C—de, and the Privileges of Parliament are Subjects of too nice and delicate a Nature to be confidered and fettled by you or me, I shall only beg Leave to transcribe a Word or two of what is said in our Histories of the Behaviour of these supposed Delinquents, and leave it to the Reader to judge, whether their Imprisonment, or the Fines which were laid upon them, were such illegal and arbitrary Punishments as you would

represent them.

Sir John Finch, Speaker of the House, had express Orders from his Majesty, that, if the Commons perfifted to asperse his Government and Ministry, he should adjourn them. Speaker therefore, after a most bitter and virulent Speech made by Sir John Elliot, delivered his Meffage, and told the House, that it was his Majesty's Command, they should adjourn to the Tuesday Sevennight following. Sir John Ellist and some others, upon this, were so exasperated, that they seem to have been lost to all Sense of Decency and Duty. They had no Respect to their Characters as Representatives. The Dignity of a parliamentary Affembly, and the Authority of their Sovereign by which they fat, seem to have been entirely disregarded. A Messenger was sent from the King to the House, and they treated him with the utmost Contempt; the Doors were shut against him, and he was denied Admittance.

Sir John Elliot, that feditious Incendiary, was the principal Instrument in promoting the

G 3 Distur-

Disturbance, and widening the Breach between the King and his Parliament. He persisted to exclaim bitterly against the Lord Treasurer and others; and said, That no Man was ever blasted in that House, but a Curse fell upon them. He then offered a Remonstrance against Tonnage and Poundage, which was refused to be read either by the Speaker or the Clerk, and returned to him again.

Sir Miles Hobart was so incensed at this Behaviour of the Speaker, that he ran and locked up the Doors of the House; and Mr. Coriton, after an unprecedented Manner, assaulted and

ftruck Mr. Winterton.

The Behaviour of Mr. Strode was equally obnoxious; he infifted upon reading the Remonstrance, That we might not, says he, be turned off like scattered Sheep, and sent home, as we were last Sessions, with a Scorn put upon us in Print.

Sir John Elliot, upon this, read out the Remonstrance himself, and it was offered to be put to the Question; but the Speaker said, He was

otherways commanded by the King.

Mr. Selden, addressing himself to the Speaker, said, Dare not you put the Question, when we command you? To which the Speaker replied, He had an express Command from his Majesty, to rise as soon as he had delivered his Message; and accordingly, he rose and left the Chair. But Mr. Denzil Holles and Mr. Valentine, with others, who were prepared, immediately drew him back, and held him in the Chair by Force. Sir

Sir Thomas Edmunds, and others of the Privy Council, endeavoured to free the Speaker; but Mr. Holles swore, He should sit still, till it

pleased them to rife.

Now can there be a more rash, a more undutiful Expression than this? Can there be a more manifest Insult upon Majesty? Let us suppose, that the Power of adjourning was absolutely in the Commons (which you must allow at least was not a fettled Point at that Time of Day) yet it is agreed, I think, that the King only could prorogue or diffolve them. But, if the Commons had a Power to fit as long as they pleased, what Power was left his Majesty? Where was his Power even of proroguing or dissolving them? Supposing his Majesty had thought proper to have put an End to their tumultuous Behaviour by immediately proroguing or diffolving them, how could he possibly have done either, when his Servants were denied the Liberty of entering the House?

Besides, was it ever heard before, that the Parliament of England resuled to receive a Message from the King? That they shut the Doors against his Servants, and denied them Admittance into the House? Be pleased only to peruse the Opinion of the learned and eminent Serjeant Maynard, upon a Case not altogether unlike the Case before us, and I fancy you will soon be convinced, that the Behaviour of your

^{*} When the Long Parliament had resolved to make no more Addresses to, nor receive any more Messages from, the King, Mr. Serjeant Maynard, a Member of the House, and a Lawyer of G 4 admired

admired Patriots abovementioned was not altogether justifiable; nor the Methods which the King took to punish them so very arbitrary and illegal as you would make us believe. If that learned Gentleman's Opinion is to be relied on, their refusing to receive a Message from the King, and excluding his Servant the Privilege of entering the House, was a Behaviour of a very exorbitant and seditious Nature; forasmuch as it tended virtually to dissolve themselves, and subvert the Constitution.

It is not pretended, that the two Cases are exactly parallel. The Parliament, to whom the learned Serjeant gave his Advice, had declared, that they would receive no more Messages from the King. The Gentlemen we have been speaking of, did not go so far; however, they refused

great Eminence, who had too much complied and concurred with their irregular and unjust Proceedings, after he had, with with great Vehemence, opposed and contradicted the most odious Parts of their Declaration, told them plainly, that "by this " Resolution of making no more Addresses to the King, they " did, as far as in them lay, dissolve the Parliament; and that, " from the Time of that Determination, he knew not with what " Security, in Point of Law, they could meet together, or any " Man join with them in their Counsels; that it was of the Es-" fence of Parliament, that they should upon all Occasions re-" pair to the King; and that his Majesty's Refusal at any Time " to receive their Petitions, or to admit their Addresses, had " been always held the highest Breach of their Privilege, be-" cause it tended to their Dissolution without dissolving them; " and therefore, if they should now, on their Parts, determine, " that they would receive no more Messages from him (which was " likewise a Part of their Declaration) nor make any more Address " to him, they did, upon the Matter, declare, that they were no " longer a Parliament." (Lord Clarendon's Hift. vol. iii. p. 94. Swo. Edit.) to

to receive a Message from his Majesty, or admit his Servant into the House, and consequently, were guilty of a Behaviour, which, according to this great Lawyer, had a Tendency to render precarious their very Authority and Character as Representatives, and undermine the Foundation of our Constitution. Whether Persons guilty of such Acts, were illegally and arbitrarily punished by his Majesty, must be left to the Reader to judge.

I shall only add, that were such monstrous Outrages as these to go unpunished, all Order and Government must be at an End; if therefore the Parliament thought proper to countenance, or even to overlook, such Offenders, who should punish them, but the supreme Governor of the Realm, whom they had insulted and offended by Acts of such a seditious and

tumultuous Nature?

But it is further said, That their Imprisonment was attended with some arbitrary Severities; that they were denied not only Pen, Ink, and Paper, but that in their Sicknesses their Wives were denied Admittance, insomuch, that Sir John Elliot, after many Years Imprisonment, sunk and died under the Oppression.

To this I shall reply, in the Words of Lord Clarendon. As to the Imprisonment of Members, the Laws were open for all Men to appeal and have recourse to; and that single Person, who died under Restraint, suffered that Restraint by a Judgment of the King's Bench; so that,

that, if there were any Injustice in the Case, it

cannot be charged upon his Majesty.*.

7. Your next Charge is, That the King, at length tired with frequent Petitions and Remonstrances of both Houses, in Vindication of their just and legal Rights, in order to establish his absolute Power and Dominion over the Lives and Properties of his Subjects, determined to have no Parliament all; and that accordingly he dissolved that Parliament, and called no other

during the twelve following Years.

That his Majesty dissolved the Parliament March 10, 1628-9, is very certain, and that he had a Right so to do, no one, I believe, will dispute. That he called no Parliament, during the twelve following Years, is likewise well known; but is it necessary, that he must do it with an Intention to enslave his People, to establish an absolute Power and Dominion over the Lives and Properties of his Subjects? Might not the Necessities of Government, or the undutiful Carriage of the Members abovenamed, oblige him to have Recourse to this extraordinary Measure?

Don't mistake me, Mr. C—de: I am not going to justify his Majesty's Conduct in this Particular. I have as great a Regard for regular and uncorrupt Parliaments, for the Rights and Liberties of the People, as you can have. I fincerely think, that they who advised his Majesty to lay aside Parliaments, and levy Money

^{*} Sir Edward Hide's Answer to the infamous and trayterous Pamphlet abovementioned, Page 67.

without

without Consent of Parliament, were greatly to blame; and, if I am not much mistaken, one or two of those, who are supposed to have given him this Advice, suffered severely for it.

I only intend, in what I am going to fay, to let you see, that his Majesty had no Design, by those unpopular Expedients, to enslave his People; that he was not that lawless Tyrant, you would make him; that he did not deliberately and strenuously endeavour to subvert and destroy the Constitution of this Kingdom; but that he was very defirous to keep up a good Understanding with his Parliament, and very unwilling to part with it; that nothing, in all Probability, could have induced him to have Recourse to fuch extraordinary Measures, but the Emergencies of the State, and fuch undutiful and feditious Behaviour in some of the Members of the House of Commons, such an Abuse of their Privileges, as is not, perhaps, to be paralleled in History *.

* His Majesty, in his most serious and resigned Moments, expressed his Regard for Parliaments, and in his Letter to the Prince of Wales, in the Eikon Basilike, has plainly intimated, that he thought it prudent in a King of England to govern by their Advice.

Nor would I, says his Majesty, have you to entertain any Averfation or Dislike of Parliaments, which, in their right Constitution, with Freedom and Honour, will never injure or diminish your Greatness, but will rather be as Interchangings of Love, Loyalty, and Con-

fidence between a Prince and his People.

Now admitting that this Letter was writ by the King, there is no Doubt to be made of it, but these were his Majesty's real Sentiments of Parliaments. It cannot be supposed, that he would give a Son, who was to succeed him, any Advice in so important an Affair, but what was really the Result of his best, his most sincere, and impartial Thoughts. The Reader there-

You know very well, that his Majesty, as foon as he came to the Throne, called a Parlia-

fore is only defired to suspend his Opinion of the Genuineness of the Eikon Basilike for the present; and in my following Remarks, if it does not appear, that there is better Evidence for its being the Work of King Charles I, than for the Genuineness of most Books which are extant, I will readily give up the Point, and publickly acknowledge my Mistake.

But if, on the other hand, it shall appear, that the Objections, which have been made to the Genuineness of it by some Writers, and particularly by the Author of the Essay towards attaining a true Idea of the Character of K. Charles, &c. have been all examined

and clearly confuted; if it shall appear,

That the Memorandum pretended to have been written by the Earl of Anglesey (the chief Grounds upon which the Objections are founded) has been thoroughly considered, and proved to be an arrant Forgery;

That the Vouchers of it, and of Bishop Gauden's Title to the said Eikon Basilike, have been duly weighed, and found to be im-

pertinent and inconfistent in their Testimony; and,

That the whole Evidence which is brought in support of the Bishop's Title, has been justly exploded by impartial Judges, as an idle Tale; if it shall further appear,

That the Eize's Basilizin, when first published, and for about forty Years afterwards, was universally received and acknow-

ledged as the King's Performance;

That Cromwell, Bradshaw, and the most inveterate Rebels and Regicides considered it as such, and employed Milton to write a

formal Answer to it; in a word,

That amongst the vast Number of Books published, and without Dispute received under the Names of their respective Authors, sew were ever known to carry along with them so many and so clear Proofs of their Genuineness as the Eikon Basilike: If all this shall appear, what must we think of a Writer, who has revived the above idle Tale a-fresh, and, without taking the least Notice of the Answers which have been given to it, has considently afferted,

That it is now proved, beyond all just and reasonable Doubt, that his Majesty was not the Author of it; that the Lustre, which this famous Book has cast upon his ROYAL CHARACTER, there is the

strongest Reason to believe, is all counterfeit and false.

What other People may think of such a Writer I can only guess. As to my own Part, I solemnly declare, that amidst the few Books I have had an Opportunity of looking into, I do not

ment, and defired fuch Supplies, as the publick Necessities required. And what was the Consequence? Why, the Commons, instead of endeavouring to oblige a Prince (who had never as yet at least shewed a Disposition to infringe upon their Liberties) entered into Debates, which reflected highly upon the Administration of the late King his Father, and which feem to have been purposely intended by some seditious Men to retard Supplies, and promote a Mifunderstanding between the King and his Parliament. Whilst fome exclaimed bitterly against supposed Grievances in the late Reign, others infifted upon an Account of the last Subsidies, and were for putting the Laws in Execution against Papists and Jesuits, and such as resorted to the Houses of foreign Ambassadors, Others, indeed, who were more moderate, and who feem to have had a Regard for the Honour of his Majesty, shewed an Inclination for preserving a good Understanding between him and his Parliament; and accordingly were for giving him a Supply, and only moved to present a Petition to his Majesty for the Honour and Safety of Religion. The Motions and moderate Councils of these last Gentlemen at length prevailed, and they voted a Supply of two Subfidies.

But the Necessities of his Majesty were still great, and required a further Supply. The Par-

remember to have met with an Author, who has ever ventured to falfify and misrepresent Facts and Characters with such deliberate Seriousness, with such a grave and methodical Air of Assurance, as this famous Essay-Writer has done.

liament,

hament, in the late Reign, had advised K. James to break the Treaties with the King of Spain, and to enter into a War with that Monarch, which was likely to be attended with considerable Expences. This War the King put the Parliament in mind of, telling them, that as it was begun by their Advice; it would be a Difbenour to him and them, if it should fail for

want of their Ashitance.

On the 1th of August, when the Parliament met at Oxford, his Majesty spoke much to the fame Purpole. The King's Speech was seconded by the two Secretaries, who urged other Reasons for a Supply, and laid before the House not only the State of Affairs with Reference to Germany. France, the Low Countries, Denmark, Sweden, and Italy, but the Condition and Necessities of the Fleets and Armies. After this, the Lord Treasurer observed, "That the Debts of the " Crown were very great; that those of the late "King amounted to above three bundred thou-" fand Pounds; that the Debts and Expences " of his present Majesty were near two bundred " thousand; and that the Navy would require " for the designed Expedition, at least three " bundred thousand Pounds more."

As the Necessities of the King were from hence manifestly great, it might have been expected, that the Parliament should readily and chearfully have granted him Supplies. Instead of this, some of the Members of the House of Commons took Advantage of the King's Necessities, and represented them in such a Light,

as ferved only to improve the popular Difcontents. By refusing to grant Supplies, suited to his Majesty's Necessities, they first disabled him from carrying on the Affairs of Government, in fuch a Manner as was confiftent with the Honour of the Nation, and then complained, that Things were conducted to the Dishonour and Reproach of the Nation .- Thus they urged, that " the Treasury was misemployed; that evil " Councils guided the King's Defigns; that the " Necessities of the Nation were all owing to a " wrong Management; that they ought to pe-" tition the King to choose a more faithful " Council; that it was not fafe to grant more " Money, till Grievances were redreffed; that " it should be declared against what Enemy the " Fleet and Army were intended; that Court-" Offices were fold; that the King had not " given a full Answer to their Petition concern-" ing Religion, nor about the Imposition upon "Wines; that all Miscarriages were chiefly " owing to the Power of the Duke of Bucking-" ing, upon whom they reflected with great Se-" verity; that he had broke the Match with " Spain, to make that with France upon much " harder Terms; that Papists were openly en-" couraged, and some Priests and Jesuits had " obtained Warrants of Pardon, dispensing with " express Statutes."

These Complaints occasioned a Conference between the Lords and Commons, who took into Consideration the several Particulars abovementioned, and more especially the State of Re-

ligion.

ligion. The Conference being ended, both Houses were ordered to meet at Christ Church in Oxford (the Parliament being adjourned thither on Account of the Plague) to receive an Answer to their Petition concerning Religion, to every Clause whereof his Majesty answered in a parliamentary Way. And yet still no Supplies were granted, though the publick Affairs required the utmost Dispatch. Some of the Commons indeed moved, that two Subfidies and two Fifteenths should be given, and urged the Neceffity of it. Others observed, that Necessity was an evil Counsellor, and that they, who had brought fuch a Necessity upon them, ought to answer for it. At length a Declaration was unanimously agreed to by the House, and sent to the King, in which they declared, That they would be ready in convenient Time, and in a parliamentary Way, to discover and reform Grievances, and to afford all necessary Supplies to his Majesty; plainly implying, that till every Thing, which they called Grievances, was redreffed, his Majesty was to expect no Supplies. This Declaration the King refented. For as he had not fat upon the Throne above fix Months, and as he justly apprehended, that the Grievances of a fix Months Reign ought not to be objected to him, fo he thought, that nothing elfe ought to interrupt an immediate Supply. When therefore the Time of the Year was far spent, and the Commons feemed rather determined to embarrass the publick Affairs, than to grant Supplies, his Majesty, on the 12th of August, sent a Commission

Commission to several Lords for the Dissolution of the Parliament, which Commission was accordingly executed, and the Parliament dissolved.

However, his Majesty, notwithstanding he had received such unkind Treatment from his Subjects, to thew his Regard for Parliaments, determined foon after to call a new one, which was to meet the February following. Accordingly, a fecond Parliament was fummoned, and met on the 6th of February, which the Commons opened with very dutiful Expressions of Respect. They particularly thanked his Majesty for his gracious Answer to their Petition in favour of Religion. But this dutiful Deportment did not last long. They foon fell to their old Work, and infifted upon Redress of Grievances. The King upon this, " preffed for a Supply, and accordingly fent " a Letter to the Speaker, wherein he declared, " that as he preffed for nothing beyond the pre-" fent State and Condition of his Subjects, fo " he would accept no less, than what was pro-" portionable to the Greatness and Goodness of " the Cause; and promised Redress of Griev-" ances, if presented in a dutiful and mannerly " Way." The King sent several other Letters and Messages to the House to the same Purpose, but without Success. The House was rather exasperated at some Expressions in his Majesty's Letters, than inclined to grant him Supplies; and at length they proceeded so far as to impeach the King's Great Favourite the Duke of Buckingham. The King upon this resolved to try the Conmons once more, and accordingly fent a Letter

Letter to the Speaker, in which he told the House, that, with Regard to a Supply, be now gave them his last and final Admonition; and that he should look upon all further Delays and Excuses to be express Denials.—But the Commons determined to raise no Money, unless the King would give up the Duke; and accordingly they agreed to prepare a formal Remonstrance against the Duke and against the taking of Tonnage and Poundage; which, after a long Debate, was voted by the House to precede the Bill of Subsidy. This so incensed his Majesty, that he resolved upon an immediate Dissolution of the Parliament, and, on the 15th of June, this second Parliament was accordingly dissolved.

His Majesty, being now deprived of a Prospect of any Aid from Parliament, had Recourse to such Measures for raising Money, as not only gave Offence, but, perhaps, were liable to Exception. These Measures were at least strenuously opposed, not only by several, who had been Members in the two late Parliaments, but by others, who were induced to follow their Ex-

amples.

The King, finding that the People were uneasy, and that his Necessities grew still more pressing on Account of a War, which he had lately entered into with France, shewed an Inclination to oblige his Subjects, and to remove the general Uneasiness. Accordingly, that great Antiquary, Sir Robert Cotton, being desired to attend the King and Council, and give his Opinion in point of History and Law upon the present

fent Conjuncture of Affairs, waited on his Majesty, and, in an honest and judicious Speech, shewed the Necessity of Parliaments, and advised his Majesty to call a new one; which Advice was approved of, it being refolved in Council, that a Parliament should be summoned to meet sometime in March. In the mean while, his Majesty issued out Warrants for releasing fuch Gentlemen, as were imprisoned for refusing to pay the Loan. The Archbishop of Canterbury likewise, the Earl of Bristol, and the Bishop of Lincoln, who had lain under his Majesty's Displeasure, had, by express Direction, their Writs fent them to fit in the House of Peers, the ensuing Parliament. And yet, notwithstanding all these obliging Overtures on his Majesty's Part, the Parliament, when they met (which was on the 17th of March) seemed still inclined to grant no Supplies, till all Grievances were redreffed. After some Debates indeed the House at length unanimously voted a Supply of five Subfidies, which was fo very acceptable to the King, that he appeared ready to oblige the Parliament in every thing they could in Reason afk. He passed the famous Bill or Petition, called the Petition of Right, to their entire Satisfaction; and all Misunderstandings between them feemed now to fubfide, and the publick Peace to be restored.

But the Misfortune was, there were fome turbulent, seditious Men, who had other Things in View than the Peace of the Nation. Their Design was to prevent an Accommodation be-

H 2

tween

tween the King and his Parliament. They were determined, that nothing should satisfy them, but the Ruin and Destruction of the Duke of Buckingham. The King's passing the Right of Petition would not content them. They still complained of Grievances, and drew up a Remonstrance, wherein they charged the Duke, with being the principal Author of all the Evils and Dangers which threatened them. They further proceeded to prepare a Bill for Tonnage and Poundage, and another Remonstrance, wherein they declared, that no Imposition ought to be laid on the Goods of Merchants, without Consent of Parliament, and that the receiving of Tonnage and Poundage, or any other Tax or Imposition, not granted in Parliament, was contrary to the Petition of Right.

The King was refolved to prevent the Delivery of this Remonstrance, and accordingly, on the 26th of June, went to the House of Lords, and put an End to the Session, the Lord Keeper declaring the Parliament prorogued to the 20th Day of October. This Parliament was further prorogued to the 20th of January following; when the House met again upon Business. And what was the Bufiness they did? Instead of confidering the publick Necessities, and endeavouring to oblige or affist his Majesty, their Debates confisted chiefly of Complaints, that the Liberty of the People had been greatly violated, fince the End of the last Session, by the Levies of Tonnage and Poundage. The King, in order to make them as easy as possible, proposed to speak with

with them at the Banquetting House in White-ball, where, in a very affectionate and obliging Speech, he told them, " That he did not take those Duties as appertaining to his bereditary Prero-" gative; that his Meaning was, ever to enjoy " them by the Gift of his People, not challeng-" ing them as of Right, but de bene esse; for " the Necessity, not for the Right he had to " take them; he therefore expected, that they " would, without Lofs of Time, by paffing the " Bill, put an End to all those Disputes."— However, his Majesty's Condescension could not induce them to pass the Bill, and their Reason for not doing it, was, perhaps, as perverse, as Sedition and Malice could fuggest. They pleaded, that the Bill ought not to be imposed upon them; but ought to proceed from the Motions of their own House; i. e. in plain English, they would not pass it, because the King pressed it, and the publick Necessities required it. The King therefore finding, that they would enter upon no Business, but what was calculated to put the Nation in a Flame, ordered the Speaker to adjourn the House to the 2d of March. Upon this, the House were incensed to a very high Degree, and guilty of the tumultuous and feditious Behaviour abovementioned. The King therefore, on the 10th of March, diffolved the Parliament, and from this Time no Parliament was called for near twelve Years afterwards.

Now, Sir, does it appear from this, or indeed from any Account, which our best Historians

H 3 have

have given us of this Part of his Majesty's Reign, that he was that lawless Tyrant, you would make him? That he dissolved the Parliament with an Intention to enslave his People? To establish an absolute Power and Dominion over the

Lives and Properties of bis Subjects?

On the other hand, is it not clear, that he had a Regard for the ancient Constitution of the Kingdom? That he was very defirous to keep up a good Correspondence with the Parliament, and very unwilling to part with it? Is it not clear, that he defired to govern by their Advice, and to receive no Supplies, but with their Confent? If this was not his Intention, why did he call a third Parliament, after he had received such unkind, such undutiful Usage from the first and second?

When the first Parliament was called, it was not pretended, that his Majesty had ever shewn the least Disposition to infringe upon the Liberties of his People, and yet the Commons not only refused to grant him such Supplies, as his Necessities required, but by their obstinate Behaviour in this Respect, first disabled him, as was said before, from carrying on the Affairs of Government, in such a Manner as was confistent with the Honour of the Nation, and then complained, that Things were conducted to the

Dishonour and Reproach of the Nation.

In the second Parliament, their Behaviour was equally obnoxious. Though the publick Necessities were manifestly great, and his Majesty promised to redress their Grievances, if presented

fented in a dutiful and mannerly Way, yet they determined to raise no Money, unless the King

would give up the Duke of Buckingham.

In the third Parliament, they likewise behaved in a very extraordinary Manner. The Regard which his Majesty paid to the Advice of Sir Robert Cotton in Council, is a manifest Proof, that he had no Intention of laying afide Parliaments. You tell us, indeed, that Sir Robert repeatedly told the King in Council, that the Nation would not bear the levying Money without Consent of Parliament, &c. (p. 13.) but that this wife and prudent Advice did not fuit the Temper of the King; that he had nothing in his Head or his Heart, but absolute Rule and Government. Now, would not any one conclude from hence, that Sir Robert had feveral Times (repeatedly) given the King this Advice in Council, and that the King was difpleased with it, and would not hearken to it? And yet the very Reverse of this is true. it does not appear, that Sir Robert was ever called upon to give his Opinion in Council, upon the publick Emergencies, but once, and then his Advice was approved of, and a Parliament was fummoned to meet in a very short Time afterwards. Even Mr. Oldmixon had Honesty enough to own as much. Sir Robert Cotton's Advice, fays he, was followed; the Prisoners, who had exclaimed against the illegal Taxes, were released, and it was resolved to call a Parliament.

H 4

During

During this Seffion, it is remarkable, that the Commons granted the King a very large Supply; a Supply of five Subfidies; and that the King was no less ready to oblige the Parliament. He affured them, that he did not claim the Duties of Tonnage and Poundage as his Right, but as the Gift of the People; and at length, to make them entirely easy, he passed the Bill, or Petition of Right, in the Manner they defired. Now, if the King had any Intention of laying afide Parliaments, and enflaving his People, why did he make them fuch obliging Overtures? Why did he pass the Petition of Right? Or, why, as was said before, did he call this third Parliament, after what had passed in the two former? It is plain from hence, that he defired to govern by the Advice of his Parliament, and that he was unwilling to part with it, till the Commons, by their undutiful and seditious Behaviour, forced him to diffolve them.

It may, perhaps, be thought rash to say, that the Commons forced his Majesty to dissolve them; but was it possible, after what they had been guilty of, that his Majesty could, consistent with the Honour and Dignity of his Crown, continue them? Their insolent and tumultuous Behaviour, in the last Parliament, was undoubtedly a shocking Insult upon the Prerogative, and enough to make his Majesty out of Humour with that Parliament at least; and, if we consider the rough and unkind Usage with which the Commons treated him in the two former, we shall have the less Cause to wonder, that he

was out of Humour with Parliaments in general.

However, Sir, we shall admit every Thing, that you can reasonably desire. Though his Majesty may have had Cause to dissolve the third Parliament, yet still we shall allow, that his not calling a Parliament for near twelve Years afterwards, was an imprudent Step, and not to be justified. We shall admit, that, in this Case, the King was ill-advised, and acted in a Manner not so popular, as might have been expected from a wise and prudent Prince.—But does it follow from hence, that he was an arbitrary, lawless Tyrant? That he deliberately and strenuously endeavoured to subvert and destroy the Constitution?

On the other hand, is it not plain, from the foregoing Account, that the Commons themselves were partly the Authors of the Grievance which you complain of? The King, it is evident, was desirous to govern by the Advice of his Parliament; and the undutiful Carriage of the Commons was manifestly the chief Cause, which induced him to dissolve it, and to lay aside all

Thoughts of calling another.

The King had gratified the Commons in every reasonable Request relating either to their Civil or Religious Privileges. He had granted them the famous Petition of Right, and given such an Answer to their Petition concerning Religion, as by their own Acknowledgment deserved an Address of Thanks. And yet all this would not content them. After all that his Majesty had

had done to oblige them, they thought proper to let him know, that unless he would give up his Prime Minister, no further Supplies were to be granted. And that he might not depend upon any Aid from the Duties of Tonnage and Poundage, they proceeded further to draw up a Remonstrance, wherein they declared, That the receiving of Tonnage and Poundage, and other Impositions, not granted in Parliament, was contrary to the Petition of Right. Thus did they endeavour, as it were, to disoblige, to distress his Majesty, and clog the Wheels of Government, when, at the same Time, the publick Necessities were very presfing. His Majesty, besides the Debts of his Father and himself, was engaged in a very expenfive War with two as powerful Monarchs, as any in Europe. Now, in such a perplexed State of Affairs, what was his Majesty to do? Was he to fuffer the Enemy to invade and over-run the Nation? Was he to suffer our Ships to be taken, our Trade to be ruined, and our Country to be exposed to the Insults and Depredations of Pyrates and Foreigners? Had he done fo, we should have had Outcries enough against his Administration. And yet, if the Parliament would grant him no Supplies, and, if it was illegal to raise Money any other Way, how could he possibly defend himself, or his People, without having Recourse to some extraordinary Measures for that Purpose?

You will tell us, perhaps, that in fuch a Cafe, the Business of his Majesty was to have complied with the Demands of the Parliament, to have given up his prime Minister, and received the Aids and Advice of the Great Council of the Nation.

But supposing it should appear, that his Majesty believed the *Duke* to be innocent of the Crimes which were laid to his Charge; was he, notwithstanding this, obliged to give him up to

the Resentment of his Enemies?

That the King believed the Duke to be innocent, and his Impeachment the Refult of Malice and Resentment is certain. His Majesty himself openly declared as much, and, in a short Speech in the House of Lords, was pleased to observe, that be could clear bim of every one of the Matters whereof he was accused. Now, whether the King's Opinion of the Duke was right or wrong, do not you think, Mr. C-de, that in fuch a Case, it would have been a Fault in his Majesty to have complied with the Demands of the Parliament, and have fuffered the Duke to have been treated as a Criminal and a Traitor? Had his Majesty denied him his Protection at such a Juncture, and given him up to the Resentment of his Enemies, how could he have acquitted himself of the greatest Cruelty and Injustice, when he believed him to be an innocent Person?

I will beg Leave, Mr. C—de, to put a Case to you, though an aukward one, which will set this Matter in a clear Light. All Parties, I think, agree, that there is such a Thing as Schism in the Church; and that that Schism is a Crime. The

Church

Church of Rome charges the Church of England with it, and the Church of England retorts the Charge upon the Church of Rome, alledging, that the Terms of Communion which she imposes upon her Members are absolutely finful. The Church of England likewise, if I mistake not, looks upon the Diffenters as Schismaticks, and the Diffenters, I am told, who conscientiously diffent from her, alledge in their Defence, that the Ceremonies enjoined by the Church of England, do not appear to them to be altogether free from Sin and Superstition. Now it is generally allowed, that if a Person, upon serious and due Enquiry, believes, that there is any thing finful or fuperstitious in the Doctrine or Worship of a Communion of Christians, it would be a Crime in that Person to subscribe to their Doctrine or join in their Worship. If you will be so good, Mr. C-de, as to apply this Case to King Charles, and only suppose that his Ma-. jesty believed the Duke to be innocent, you will find, that he was not at Liberty to give him up to the Refentment of the Parliament.

But let us suppose, for Argument's Sake, that the King had given up the Duke, are you sure, that this would have contented the Parliament? are you sure that they would not have made surther Demands upon his Majesty? that they would not have insisted upon his giving up other Ministers, besides the Prime Minister? nay, can you be certain that they had not a Design to overturn the Constitution, and that they would not have insisted upon his Majesty's giving

ing up that, as well as the Duke? It is well known, that as foon as they had an Opportunity, they not only impeached others of the Ministry, besides the Duke, but actually subverted and destroyed the Constitution, and, with an Infolence which perhaps is not to be paralleled in History, infifted upon his Majesty's consenting to it. Now is it possible to be better assured of what those Gentlemen intended, than by what they acted? As the Actions of Mankind are the best Comment upon their Intentions, it is evident that the Opposition which was made to the King, by some of the Commons at least, was feditious and ill-defigned. Their Defign, it is plain, was to diffress his Majesty, to throw Things into Confusion, and subvert the Constitution.

The Murder of the King, and the actual Subversion of the Government, are incontestable Proofs of their wicked and feditious Intentions. And accordingly they are branded in our Laws, with Epithets which may render their Memory infamous to Posterity. The Statute in the 12th of Charles II. denominates them wretched Men. desperately wicked, and bardened in their Impiety; and the Parliament renounce, abominate, and protest against, not only that borrid Fact, the execrable Murder of the King, but all Proceedings tending thereunto. As this is the Case, what shocking Insolence is it in any one to justify Proceedings, which, by the express Letter of the Statute, are so solemnly condemned and protested against? What shocking Insolence, to charge the

the King with intending a Subversion of the Conflitution, which was manifestly intended, and actually effected, by his rebellious Subjects? Heavens! what an Age do we live in, when the most horrid Rebellion, a Rebellion which will be an eternal Reproach to our Nation, is not only justified, but laid to the Charge of the unfortunate Prince, whom the infamous Authors of it dethroned and murdered?

But to proceed; whatever were the Defigns of his Majesty, I think it is very plain, that the Designs of some other People were not so honest as they should be: And though you are pleased to tell us, that the King deliberately endeavoured to subvert the Government, and enslave his People, I am well assured, you will find it a difficult Task to prove, that any thing of this kind can fairly be concluded, either from his Character in general, or from any particular Acts of Power which he exercised throughout his whole Reign.

As long as the Parliament behaved with any tolerable Decency, it is clear from the foregoing Account, that he regularly applied to them for Supplies, and shewed a Disposition to govern by their Advice. Nor does it appear that he had any Thoughts of levying Money without their Consent (but such as his Royal Predecessors had received in the same Manner before him) till the Commons were guilty of the most tumultuous and seditious Behaviour; till they made such Demands upon his Majesty, as he could not in Conscience comply with; and till they openly declared.

[111]

declared, that unless he would comply with them, no further Supplies should be granted.

The Conduct of his Majesty being thus accounted for during the three first Parliaments, it may not be amiss to enquire how he behaved after this Period.—Now, from the Time that he determined to call no Parliament, he became, Mr. C——de tells us, a most lawless Tyrant.

8. For near twelve Years, says he, he governed as arbitrarily as the Grand Signior, and in a manner subversive of all the fundamental

Laws of the Realm.

The Answer to this Charge must be deferred, till I am a little more at Leisure. I am forry I should be obliged to trouble you or the Publick so often. I could heartily wish I had less Interruptions, and that my Affairs would permit me to attend upon our Dispute in a better Manner. However, if you will give me Credit a Post or two, I hope to be able by that Time to dispatch the whole Business, and (Errors excepted) fully to ballance Accompts between us. If any Errors should appear, I solemnly declare, that they are involuntary, and shall readily make my Acknowledgments to you and the World. I only expect the common Indulgence in such Cases.

I am, Sir, Yours, etc.

Hatton Garden, April, 1748.

The End of the THIRD LETTER.

them, no further beppiles thould be granteder

LETTER IV.

n'n y ser ce anns eo wegee newhee oenende aner nie Period — Now, nion die Time dar be dejerrened to call no Perionent, *jeriecean*t,

Nr. Land town , a select the J.M.

I HAVE at length confidered your most material Charge against K. Charles I, and shall give you my Thoughts upon it without further

Ceremony.

You tell us, That from the Time be (K. Charles) determined to call no Parliament, be became a most lawless Tyrant; that, for near twelve Years, he governed as arbitrarily, as the Grand Signior, and in a Manner Subversive of all the fundamental Laws of the Realm. But how is this great Charge supported? Why, we are told, That, in the first seven Years of this Time, he published no less than one hundred and forty-fix Proclamations, the chief Defign of which was to raise Money without Consent or Authority of Parliament, under the Denomination of Conduct-money, Tonnage, Poundage, Ship-money, &c. &c. and that when some of the Lawyers began to exert themselves in Defence of the People's Rights and Privileges, and declared, that it was illegal to impose Taxes without Consent of Parliament, the Court created or revived arbitrary Courts, as the Star-Chamber and High Commission Court, wherein monstrous LETTER

monstrous Cruelties were daily committed, even on Persons of high Rank, Quality, and Learn-

ing.

A heavy Charge indeed! but it is to be hoped, not so bad as you represent it. Had King Charles been such a lawless Tyrant as you would make him, is it possible, as I observed in a former Letter, that one of the most august Assemblies upon Earth, the King, Lords, and Commons in Parliament, would have done him the Honour to declare him a Martyr for the Protestant Religion, and to institute an Anniversary for detesting the treasonable Principles and Practices, by which he was deposed and murdered? is it possible, that that august Assembly would have done him fuch Honour, had he governed in the Manner you say he did, viz. as arbitrarily as the Grand Signior? The Will of the Grand Signior, we all know, is the fole Rule of his Government, and his Subjects are absolutely Slaves. But was this the Cafe of K. Charles and his Subjects? Had his Majesty really no Reason for having Recourse to some extraordinary Measures, but because it was his Will so to do? Did not the Necessities of the State oblige him to act in the Manner he did?

You are to remember, Mr. C—de, that the Trust reposed with a King of England is of the greatest and most important Nature. He is the Guardian not only of the Laws, but of the Liberties of the People. He swears that he will protect and defend both; and as the Rights and Liberties of the People, or, in other Words, the Welfare

Welfare of the State, is that Part of his Charge, to which his Care ought in an especial Manner to be directed; as the very Laws are made and designed to support that, and the Honour and Dignity of the Crown, the best of Princes, it is well known, have not scrupled to deviate from the strict Letter of the Laws, when the Emer-

gencies of the State have required it.

You will please to remember further, that the Case of K. Charles was very extraordinary; that the Parliament would grant his Majesty no further Supplies, but upon Terms which he could not in Conscience comply with. Unless therefore he had had Recourse to some extraordinary Expedients for that Purpose, how was the Great Trust reposed with him to be discharged? how were the Rights and Liberties of the People to be defended? how was the Honour and Dignity of the Crown to be supported? The Loans, Privy Seals, and other Courses of raising Money (fays the judicious Sir Edward Hyde) were upon extraordinary and emergent Occasions, and of the same Nature, that have been in all Times practised, upon Reason and Necessity of State.

They were the Necessities of the State which put his Majesty upon reviving obsolete Laws; which put him upon collecting Ship-Money; which put him upon divers other Projects of the like Nature; by which (as the noble Historian observes) the Subject might be taught, how unthrifty a Thing it was, by too strict a detaining what was his, to put the King as strictly to

enquire what was his own.

And even in these Cases, his Majesty acted with as much Prudence and Caution, with as much Tenderness towards his Subjects, as the publick Emergencies would admit of. With respect to Ship-Money (that Opprobrium of all Oppression and Slavery, as bis Enemies were pleased to call it) his Majesty advised with the Judges, the fworn Interpreters of the Law, about the Legality of collecting it; nor did he presume to have Recourse to such an extraordinary Measure, till those Gentlemen had varnished it over with the Colour of Justice; till they had declared the levying it to be legal, and his Majesty believed it to be just. And no sooner was he convinced, that it was an unwarrantable Stretch of the Prerogative, that it was contrary to the Laws of the Realm, and the Subjects Right of Property, but he readily quitted it, and passed an Act, whereby he divested himself and his Successors, of a Power to receive it for ever after. Now pray, Mr. C-de, confider with yourself, are these the Actions of a lawless, arbitrary Tyrant? is this governing like the Grand Signior? On the other hand, amidst such Emergencies, who could have acted with more Prudence and Caution than his Majesty did?

I shall only at present add a Remark or two, which the learned Sir Edward Hyde has made upon this Particular, they being too material not to be mentioned. — To omit, says he, the other Particulars of Salt, Allum, Tobacco, and the rest, upon every one of which they (the Parliament) have, by their particular Ordinances,

I 2

laid

laid much beavier Taxes than was thought of in those Times; it is surprizing, that they should reproach the King with the Ship-Money (which by their own Computation came not to above 200,000 l. by the Year) as the Compendium of all Oppression and Slavery, for which his Majesty had a Judgment in a Court of Law, before all the Judges of England; and which was always levied by the due Forms of Law, and which his Majesty, when he was informed of the Injustice of it, frankly quitted, and did bis best to pull it up by the Roots, that no Branch of it may bereafter grow up to the Disquiet of his People; when themselves have almost ever since, by that one Ordinance of the 1st of March, 1642, imposed a weekly Tax upon the Kingdom of three and thirty Thousand, five Hundred and eighteen Pounds, which in the Year amounts to no less than one Million, seven hundred forty-two Thousand, nine Hundred and odd Pounds; to which they have since added, by their Ordinance of the 18th of October, 1644, for the Relief of the British Army in Ireland, a weekly Tax upon the Kingdom of 3800l. which in the Year comes to 197,600 and odd Pounds (as much as ever Ship-Money arofe to) over and above Free-quarter, and all other Orders for Sequestration, and twentieth Part, and the cruel Circumstances in the executing those and all other Ordinances; against the irregular doing whereof, they will allow no Appeal to the Judges, though of their own making, but reserve the entire Connusance and Direction to themselves. (Sir Edw. Hyde's Answer

Answer to the infamous Pamphlet abovemen-

tioned, pages 63, 64.)

But the Method of collecting Taxes without Consent of Parliament, I shall have Occasion to consider in the following Pages. At present I beg Leave to make a Remark or two upon the Proceedings in the Star-Chamber, and High-Commission Courts, which, I own freely, I think were the greatest Blemishes of his Majesty's Reign. The general Method of proceeding in them * was very irregular, and such a Stretch of the Prerogative, as could not but give great and just Offence in a free and limited Government.

Extraordinary Occasions had been strong Arguments for extraordinary Taxes. Imminent Necesfity and publick Welfare, fays the noble Historian, were convincing Persuasions, and it might not feem of apparent ill Consequence to the People, that, upon an emergent Occasion, the REGAL Power should fill up an Hiatus, or supply an Impotency in the Law. But when they faw in a Court of Law (that Law which gave them Title to, and Possession of all that they had) Reason of State urged as Elements of Law, Judges as sharp-fighted as Secretaries of State, and in the Mysteries of State; Judgment of Law grounded upon Matter of Fact, of which there was neither Enquiry or Proof, and no Reason given for the Payment of the Tax in Question, but what included the Estates of all the Standers-by, they had no Reason to hope THAT DOCTRINE, or the

^{*} History of the Rebellion, p. 69. 8vo. Edit.

Promoters of it, would be contained within any Bounds*. The People had undoubtedly great Reason to complain of such Proceedings; and it is no Wonder that the Judges, who abused their Power, and enlarged the Jurisdiction of his Majesty's Courts in such a Manner, should become the Objects of the publick Resentment.

But fince all this is allowed, why, Mr. C-de, would you aggravate Matters, and make Things worse than they really were? why would you choose to charge his Majesty with every Thing which was done amiss in his Reign? was his Maiesty to be blamed for all the Impertinencies and Insolencies, for all the irregular Proceedings of his Judges in the Courts abovementioned? might not the same Judges, who imposed upon him in the Cafe of Ship-Money, deceive him with Respect to the Extent of his Prerogative and the Jurisdiction of his Courts? It is most certain, that they not only deceived him in these Refpects, but abused his Prerogative to the Prejudice of his People; and accordingly the Earl of Clarendon expresly blames them for it. -Thefe Errors, fays he, (for Errors they were in View, and Errors they are proved by the Success) are not to be imputed to the Court, but to the Spirit and Over-activity of the Lawyers themfelves; who should more carefully have preserved their Profession and its Professors, from being profaned by those Services, which have rendered both so obnoxious to Reproach +.

^{*} Clarendon's Hiftory, Vol. I. p. 70. 8vo. Edit.

⁺ Ibid. p. 73

Here you fee, the noble Historian acquits the Court of all that Abuse of Power which you seem to lay to their Charge. You tell us, that in order to oblige the People to pay those illegal Taxes, which were demanded of them, the Court created or revived arbitrary Courts, as the Star-Chamber and High Commission Courts, wherein monstrous Cruelties were daily committed, on Persons of high Rank and Quality.

That the Jurisdiction of those Courts was greatly enlarged by the Judges, who then presided in them, is readily allowed. But the Account which you have given of them implies a good deal more. The Words (created or revived) are manifestly calculated to impose upon your Readers. The Star-Chamber and High-Commission Courts were in Being, long before the Commencement of K. Charles's Reign; and they who look back upon the Council-Books of Queen Elizabeth, and the Acts of the Star-Chamber then, shall find as high Instances of Power and Sovereignty upon the Liberty and Property of the Subject, as can be since given *.

As this is the Case, why must the Words created or revived be made use of? why would you make your Readers believe, that those Courts were first created in the Reign of K. Charles? The Reason, Mr. C——de, is obvious. Mr. Oldmixon had said something like it; and it must be owned, you seldom sail to improve upon the Narratives of that celebrated Lover of Truth. Mr. Oldmixon had observed, from an anony-

^{*} Clarendon's History, Vol. I. p. 72.

mous Writer, who lived some Time since the Revolution, that K. Charles CREATED arbitrary Courts and enlarged others, as the High-Commission Court, Star-Chamber Court, Sc. and that unspeakable Oppressions were committed in

them, even on Men of the first Quality.

Where it is observable, that this Writer, agreeable to Lord Clarendon, tells us, that the Star-Chamber and High-Commission Courts were enlarged: He says indeed, that there were some other Courts created in this Reign; and you, out of your great Zeal for Truth, tell us, that they were the High-Commission and Star-Chamber Courts.

However, I do not suppose but you knew, that those Courts were in Being long before the Reign of K. Charles; but this Piece of Knowledge was, perhaps, not so proper to be communicated to your Readers. To tell your Readers, that they were created or revived in the Reign of that lawless Tyrant K. Charles, was much more to your Purpose. Could your Readers once be induced to believe, that K. Charles first erected them, they must naturally conclude, that he was the Author of all those monstrous Cruclies, of which, you say, they were productive.

But why would you take so much artful and disingenuous Pains, to blacken and abuse the Memory of that unfortunate Prince? In one single Paragraph, by Virtue of the Words Court, created, and monstrous Cruelties were daily committed, you have suggested no less than three potorious Falshoods, to the Prejudice of his

Majesty's

Majesty's Character, and the Discredit of his Reign. You tell us, that the Court, i.e. I suppose, the King and the Privy Council, CRE-ATED or revived arbitrary Courts, as the Star-Chamber and High-Commission Court, and that in thefe Courts MONSTROUS CRUELTIES WERE DAILY committed, on Persons of high Rank, Quality, and Learning.

Now what must the Reader conclude from hence, but that his Majesty was one of the most cruel and bloody Tyrants upon Earth? You hereby plainly infinuate, that his Reign, as long as those Courts lasted, was a continued (a daily) Scene of shocking Cruelties and Oppression. In a word, your Affertion evidently implies the

three following Particulars:

1. That the King created or revived arbitrary Courts, as the Star-Chamber and High-Commiffion Court.

2. That monstrous Cruelties were daily committed in them, on Persons of high Rank, Qua-

lity, and Learning. And,

3. That consequently all those cruel, and unjust Proceedings, must be charged to his Majesty's Account.

But is there the least Shadow of Truth in ei-

ther of these Infinuations? For,

1. Did his Majesty create the Courts which you complain of? No, Sir. They were in Being long before his Majesty ascended the Throne; and had the Judges who prefided in them kept within the Bounds of their Duty, it is the Opinion of wifer Men than you or I, that they might have

have been made very serviceable to the beneficial Ends of Government; that they might have been made a proper Check to that Faction and Sedition, which disturbed the Peace of his Majesty's Reign, and at last overturned the Government in

Church and State. But,

ovaci

2. It must be owned, the Use which was made of those Courts, was neither for the Honour of his Majesty nor the Good of his People. They were employed, it is granted, to very ill and impolitick Purposes. The Judges who prefided in them, stretched the Prerogative beyond its due Bounds, and abused their Power; and the Fines and other Punishments, which they inflicted upon Offenders, were frequently thought to be too fevere. But does it follow from hence, that his Majesty's Reign was a continued (a daiby) Scene of Cruelty and Oppression? Does it follow from hence, that monstrous Cruelties were daily committed on Persons of high Rank and Quality? Pray, Mr. C-de, how many Persons were there of any Rank or Quality, who underwent those Cruelties you speak of? how many were there, who suffered by Pillories; Whipping, cutting off of Ears, or any such corporal Punishments? Had monstrous Cruelties been daily committed on Persons of Rank and Quality, for the Space of fourteen or fifteen Years (and fo long the Courts abovementioned lasted) the Number of Persons who suffered must have been very considerable; they must have been several Hundreds at least, if not Thoufands; and yet, which demonstrates the notorious

rious Falshood of this base Infinuation, it is remarkable that there were not above fix Persons, during the first fifteen Years of his Majesty's Reign, upon whom any of the Punishments abovementioned were inflicted. It is an undeniable Evidence (fays the learned and judicious. Sir Edward Hyde) of the excellent Government, Sobriety, and Obedience, at that Time, that there were not above fix infamous Persons, from the Beginning of his Majesty's Reign to the first Day of this unhappy Parliament (meaning the Long Parliament) who were publickly taken Notice of, to have merited those corporal Punishments and Shame; and of the Mercy of that Time, that those suffered no greater, there being not one of them, who was not guilty of Sedition to that Degree, that by the Law, they were liable to beavier Judgments than they underwent.

As the Persons here alluded to were manisestly Prynne, Bastwick, Burton, Leighton, &c. so our illustrious Author cannot be suspected of speaking with too great Severity of them. He was a Gentleman remarkable for his Humanity and moderate Principles, and by no means a Friend to the Courts in which they received their Sentences. He had besides a thorough Knowledge of our Laws, and was too well acquainted with the Nature of Offences, to represent Offenders in a worse Light than they deserved. And yet you find, he does not scruple to declare, that they were infamous Persons; Persons who were guilty of such seditious Practices, as by the Law were

were liable to heavier Judgments than they underwent.

As to your Saint LEIGHTON, whose Sufferings Mr. Oldmixon (not you, Sir; for you have scarce a Sentence of your own that is material, in this or in any other Part of your Letter) whose Sufferings, I say, Mr. Oldmixon has laboured with fuch descriptive Artifice to paint in the most hideous Light, even Rusbworth tells us, that the two Lord Chief Justices being present, delivered their Opinions, that they would, without any Scruple, bave proceeded against the Defendant as for Treafon, committed by him, if be bad come before them. And other Lords expressly affirmed, that it was bis Majefty's exceeding great Mercy and Goodness, that he was brought to receive Censure of this Court, and not questioned at any Tribunal as a Traitor. (Rushw. Part II. p. 56.)

Martyrs, whose Sufferings you have displayed in so tragical a Manner, were nothing less than seditious and traiterous Offences against the Government. They were none of your religious Scruples; nor indeed was it ever pretended, that those infamous Wretches were punished or perfecuted for Conscience-sake. Their Crimes were downright Sedition and sactious Libel. Crimes directly calculated to disturb the publick Peace, to inslame the Populace, and undermine the

Foundations of Government.

And your Suggestion, that they were Persons of Rank and Learning is as little to your Purpose. This Circumstance is so far from mitigating

gating their Guilt, that it aggravates and enhances it. If they were Persons of Rank and Learning, they were the more capable of fpreading the Infection of their feditious Tenets amongst the People, and incensing them against their Governors. The ill Consequences, which threaten a State from the seditious Libels of Persons of Rank and Learning, are greater, than can possibly be apprehended from the most indiscreet Conduct of Persons who are illiterate, and in a low Station of Life. And yet I'll venture to fay, that the Sufferings of one of those illiterate Scoundrels, who has undergone military Discipline, for Mutiny, for Desertion, or for drinking a treasonable Health; who has been picotted and whipped through a Regiment three Market-Days successively, if properly described, would look as frightful in Print, and cut as tragical a Figure, as the Punishments of Prynne, Bastwick, Leighton, or any of your State-Martyrs abovementioned. And if so, why would you name the Names of fuch infamous Offenders? Is it possible, that the Names of such Men can be of Service to any Cause whatsoever? Can you conceive, that Punishments inflicted upon such notorious Disturbers of the publick Peace, will ever make the ferious Reader believe, that K. Charles was a bloody, lawless Tyrant? And yet these are the Wretches, whose Names and Punishments are perpetually rung in our Ears, and urged as Proofs, that his Majesty's Reign was a continued Scene of Barbarity and Oppression; that monstrous Cruelties were daily committed

on Persons of bigb Rank, Quality, and Learn-

ing.

The farcical Rhapfody, with which you conclude the Account of Leighton's Sufferings, is too material not to be mentioned. Having given us, from Mr. Oldmixon, a Description of his being whipped and stigmatized as a Sower of Sedition, you add, in great Extasy, my Hand trembles, my Heart bleeds, I can go no further. But can you be so weak, as to think, that such wretched Stuff as this, will pass with Men of Sense? Pray, Mr. C-de, what was it, which you faw or read in the Account, that put you in fuch an Agony? You have certainly feen or heard of Punishments equally severe without a trembling Hand or a bleeding Heart. Did you never see a Fellow for Desertion, or for drinking a treasonable Health, picotted, till he has been black in the Face? till the Blood has started out of his Ears and Nose? in short, till he has been in fuch Agonies, that the Spectators have thought him expiring?

Again, have you never heard, that a Person for the same Crime has been fettered with heavy Bolts, tied Neck and Heels, and cast into a nasty Doghole or Dungeon? That, after this, he has received five hundred Lashes (several hundreds, at least, more than your Martyr received) and before his Back has been cured, the same Number a second Time, till it has looked of all Sorts of Colours, till Collops of Flesh have followed the Whip, and left the Back-bone almost bare? Have you never heard, that the same Person

has at length been whipped out of the Regiment to which he belonged, with a Halter about his Neck, and left to undergo the Pain and Smart of his Indifcretion, without, perhaps, a Penny in his Pocket to help himself? But my Hand trembles, my Heart bleeds, I can go no further; Teneatis Amici?

You certainly forgot yourself, Mr. C——de, when you talked of a trembling Hand, and a bleeding Heart. This was not the Reason, that you could write no further. The Reason was plainly this; you had nothing more to write. You had transcribed, what your Friend Oldmixon had furnished you with, and given us a considerable Specimen of your own Invention into the Bargain. And had you made your Martyr pass through another subterraneous Passage, which had not been opened since the bloody Reign of Q. Mary, and set the whole House of Commons a CRYING a second Time, I should not have wondered at it at all.

Mr. Oldmixon, at the End of near a hundred Years, without the help of one fingle Record of a publick Nature, undertakes to give us an exact Account, how this State-Martyr was apprehended and committed to Prison. And in order to make the Scene appear as tragical as possible, the Time when, and the Place where he was arrested, the Fellows who arrested him, his Fetters, his Prison, and other the most idle and minute Circumstances, are described in a very particular Manner. We are told, "That he was arrested by two High Commission Pur-

" fuivants, Cross and Tomlins (two Ruffians be-" longing to the Court of Star-Chamber, fays " Mr. C-de) as he came out of Black-" Fryars Church, who dragged him with great " Force and Violence to Laud's House; - and " from thence led him through a subterraneous " Passage (fays Mr. C-de) through a blind, " hollow Way (fays the Petition, in Mr. Chand-" ler's History) to a Door, which had not been " opened fince the bloody Reign of Q. Mary, " and having provided Bolts to put on his " Hands (having fettered him there with heavy " Bolts, fays Mr. C-de) he was carried with " a huge Multitude of Bills and Staves to New-" gate (the Allusion here is too impious to be " mentioned) where, in the Entry, his Wife was " almost killed, and himself was cast into a " nasty Doghole full of Rats and Mice; no " Light, but from the uncovered Roof (fays " Mr. C-de) no Light, but a little Grate " (fays the Petition) no Place, but the Ruins " of an old Chimney for Fire; no Bedding and " no Meat nor Drink from Tuesday Night to " Thursday Noon. In this doleful Place and " Plight they kept him with two Doors shut " upon him (i. e. I suppose the Prison Doors " were kept fast, and bow else could be bave " been confined) for the Space of fifteen Weeks, " fuffering none to come at him, not even his " Wife in all that Time (fays Mr. C-de,) " till at length his Wife was only admitted (fays " the Petition.)" With

With this, and a good deal more such low, idle, impertinent Stuff, does Mr. Oldmixon entertain and endeavour to impose upon his Readers. For supposing the main of the Story to be true, what, besides the Embellishments, does the Purport of it amount to, but that a most seditious Disturber of the publick Peace (who ought, in the Opinion of the two Lord Chief Justices, to have been hanged) was apprehended, committed to Prison, and treated with some Se-

verity.

But our Historian goes on, and tells us, that the Sentence, which was paffed upon him, was monstrously severe; that he was fined 10,000 l. that he was ordered to be whipped, and to fland in the Pillory, to have his Ears cut off, his Nofe flit, and to be stigmatized as a Sower of Sedition; that, in the Year 1640, he petitioned the Parliament for Redress, and that when the following Part of his Petition was read (your Petitioner's Hands being tied to a Stake, befides other Torments, he received thirty-fix Stripes with a terrible Cord (fays Mr. Oldmixon) with a treble Cord (fays Mr. C-de.) After which be flood almost two Hours in the Pillory, in Cold. Frost, and Snow; and then suffered the rest, as cutting off the Ear, firing the Face, slitting up the Nose.) When this Part of the Petition was read, the Historian tell us, That the Clerk of the House of Commons was ordered to stop; and when he was going on again, the Compassion of the House was such, that he was bid to stop again, till they had recovered themselves.

K

This

This was a Circumstance too affecting not to be improved; and it must be owned, Mr. C-de, you have improved it with a witness. You have here evidently outdone your great Master Oldmixon, that celebrated Lover of Truth, in the very Faculty, for which he was fo renowned, and in which I once verily thought he would never have been rivalled. Mr. Oldmixon, as I faid before, had observed, that when the Clerk was going on again, the Compassion of the House was such, that he was bid to stop again, till they had recovered themselves. This artful Infinuation (for which there is not the least Foundation, in any authentick History upon Earth, that I can meet with) was not worded, it feems, in Terms strong enough. You was, therefore, resolved to make the most of it, and, by way of Improvement, have in Effect told us, That the House of Commons fell a crying. The Clerk, fays Mr. C-de, was ordered to flop a second Time, till the Auditors recovered themselves a little; for the House was melted down with Tears, Tenderness, and Compassion *.

But

^{*} Since I wrote this, I have had the Satisfaction of seeing the Journals of the House of Commons; and, if I am not greatly mistaken, I have discovered the Circumstance, which Mr. Oldmixon, Mr. C—de, and others, have improved into such a tragical Scene. The Petition of Alexander Leighton was read, in the House of Commons, twice in one Day, and the Reason for reading it a second Time is expressly assigned. The Words in the Journals are these:

[&]quot; Nov. 9, 1640. The humble Petition of Alexander Leighton,

[&]quot; Prisoner in the Fleet, was read.

[&]quot; Nov. 9, 1640. The humble Petition of Mr. Alexander " Leighton again read, because many of the Members, that went up with the Message, were not present at the sirst reading."

But could you imagine, that fuch mean Artifice, such base Misrepresentation as this, would pass upon the intelligent World, and not be obferved? The whole Account of your State Martyr, in short, is mere Art and Management, directly calculated to amuse and mislead your Readers. In order to divert them from attending to the main Point, to the feditions and trayterous Nature of his Behaviour, we are entertained with a paultry, but heightened View of the Punishment be underwent. Thus the Manner and Instruments of it are touched with the most glaring Colours, and displayed in the most hideous Light. It was not enough to tell us, that he was whipped, that he flood in the Pillory, and was fligmatized as a Sower of Sedition; we must be told, that be received thirtyfix Stripes with a treble Cord; that he flood in the Pillory two Hours, in Cold, Frost, and Snow; that his Ears were cut off, his Nose shit, and his Face fired; and, to finish the Picture, the House of Commons (wretched Artifice!) must be represented crying, melted into Tears with the bare Recital of the Punishment of a Criminal, who ought to have been tried as a Traytor.

I am perfectly ashamed to trouble the Reader with any thing further upon the Subject, and shall leave him to consider, what miserable

Now, whether the Gentlemen abovementioned, who are fo good at Invention, have not improved this fecond reading into an Order, that the Clerk should stop a fecond Time, till the Auditors had recovered themselves, and dried up their Tears, I must leave the Reader to determine.

Shifts

Shifts a Writer must be reduced to, who, in Defence of the Cause he espouses, is forced to have Recourse to infamous Falsboods, to the lowest Impertinencies, to base Misrepresentations; in a word, to every the meanest Artifice, that can be thought of. It must certainly be a most glorious, a most righteous Cause, which wants such an Advocate and such Artifice to defend it.

But after all, you will tell us, perhaps, that the Punishments, which were inflicted upon this and the other Gentlemen abovementioned, were too severe; that the Crimes, they were guilty of, bore no Proportion to the Sentences, which were passed upon them; that in a Country, which has Pretensions to Freedom and true Religion, Persons of Rank and Learning should at least be exempted from Punishments of such a cruel and

scandalous Nature.

Whether their Punishments were disproportioned to the Nature of their Crimes, I must leave the Reader to determine. The two Lord Chief Justices declared, as I said before, That they would, without any Scruple, have proceeded against Leighton, as for Treason committed by him, if he had come before them.—And it is remarkable, says Fuller, that among the many Accusations charged on Archbishop Laud at his Trial, the Severity on Leighton is not at all mentioned, chiefly because (though he might be suspected active therein) his Faults were of so high a Nature, none then, or since, dare appear in his Defence*. The Remark of Sir Edward

^{*} Histor. B. xi. p. 106.

Hyde, upon the Occasion, is still more full to the Purpose—There was not one of them (meaning Bastwick, Prynne, Burton, Leighton, &c.) says he, who was not guilty of Sedition to that Degree, that, by the Law, they were liable to heavier Judgments, than they underwent.

Having observed thus much, Mr. C-de, I shall concur with you in every thing, that you can reasonably defire. I beg Leave to assure you, that I have as great an Abhorrence of any Thing, that looks like Cruelty, as you or any Man living. Slitting up the Nofes, and firing the Faces of Gentlemen, I agree with you, are shocking Punishments: Punishments, which Nature starts at ; and which are much better calculated for distant Climates; for a People of bloodier Dispositions, than I would willingly believe can ever dwell in the Breasts of trueborn Englishmen. Punishments of such a cruel and scandalous Nature are not to be endured. They are a Reproach to our natural Tempers, and our natural Bravery. In a word, they are a Reproach to the mild and moderate Nature of our excellent Constitution and Laws; and I fincerely hope, we shall never live to see Severities, which approach fo near to foreign Cruelties, acted over again in these Kingdoms. I hope the Necessity of Affairs will never require it. But when all this is admitted, what is it to your Purpose? Does it follow from hence, that the Reign of King Charles was a continued (a daily) Scene of Barbarity and Oppression?

During his Majesty's Reign, it happened that four or five Persons of reputable Professions were guilty of Crimes of a very seditious and treasonable Nature; and being discovered, were punished with some Severity. But is it not base Misrepresentation to infinuate, that those four or five Persons were so many hundred, or rather so many thousand Persons of Rank and Quality? Is it not base to infer from hence, that monstrous Cruelties were daily committed on Persons of high Rank, Quality, and Learning?

It is really furprizing, Mr. C-de, that you should so much as mention the Names of fuch Offenders, or imagine, that their Punishments would reflect any great Discredit upon the Memory of K. Charles, when you confider, what dreadful Evils were consequent upon their seditions Behaviour. It was the feditions Libels and Discourses of such infamous Men, which incensed the Populace against his Majesty's Government, and brought on that unparalleled Scene of Confusion and Misery, which was confequent upon it. And was the Government to blame for making Examples of Men, who were guilty of Crimes, which directly tended to obitruct the Happiness of every individual Member of the Community? The Nature of their Offences, and the Necessity of Affairs, demanded Severity. It had been Cruelty to the Publick to have spared them. Even Rushworth, speaking of Leighton's Punishment, owns, that the Necessity of Affairs at that Time required this Severity at the Hand of the Magistrate, more

more than perhaps the Crime would do in a

following Juntture. on all back

When, therefore, I hear you charging his Majefty with Cruelty, for punishing a few Persons, who were guilty of Crimes of fuch a feditious and trayterous Nature, I own I am greatly furprized; especially, when I consider what a shocking Scene of Barbarity and Oppression was acted by that very Parliament, whose Cause you espouse. The Proceedings and Judgments, which were passed upon the Criminals abovementioned, were passed in due Form of Law, in Courts of Justice; nor is it pretended, that either of them was innocent of the Crimes, with which they were charged. Whereas they (the Parliament) fays Sir Edward Hyde, without any Colour of Jurisdiction, but what themselves bad assumed and usurped, instead of inflicting any ordinary Punishment, took away the Lives of . their Fellow-Subjects, who had not trespassed against any known Law, and imprisoned others with such unusual Circumstances of Restraint, Cruelty, and Inhumanity, that many Persons of Reputation, Integrity, and Fortune, being first robbed and spoiled of all their Estates, for not conforming themselves to the Wickedness of the Time, perished in Prison, and very many of the same Condition are like to do so, for want of such Nourishment, as may satisfy Nature.

Is there a Scene like this, Mr. C—de, to be met with in the Reign of K. Charles? No, Sir: On the other hand, it is remarkable, that, during his whole Government, he never punished

nished one fingle Person with Death, but with Reluctance. And the noble Historian, who lived in those Times, and who must be a better Judge of them than you or I, has affured us, that " during the whole Time, that these Pres-" fures (meaning the Methods which were taken " for raifing Money) were exercised, and those " new and extraordinary Ways were run; that " is, from the Diffolution of the Parliament, in " the fourth Year, to the Beginning of this Par-" liament, which is above twelve Years, this " Kingdom enjoyed the greatest Calm, and ful-" lest Measure of Felicity; that any People in " any Age, for fo long a Time together, have " been bleffed with, to the Wonder and Glory of all the other Parts in Gbriffendom." (Clar. Jurifaishion, but what t (.8. q. i.lov

3. But, perhaps, you will fay, that amidst all the Felicity, which Lord Clarendon talks of. it is clear from his own History, that the Nation. was then burdened with fome Preffures and Impositions of a particular Nature, several Taxes being demanded in an unufual Manner, and feveral Gentlemen severely fined and imprisoned for robbed and fooiled of all the

not paying them.

Very true, Mr. C-de; I agree, that the Manner in which those Taxes were levied was irregular. I agree, that his Majesty was illadvised, when he was advised to have Recourse to fuch extraordinary Measures; and I hope we shall never live to see either such Measures taken, or such Burdens laid upon the Subject a chosel his whole Covernment, he never pur fecond Time. I hope the Exigencies of the State will never require it. we shall at the bannon's

At present, Mr. C-de, we are manifestly out of Danger. Under the present wise and glorious Administration, we are fure to be governed by Laws of our own making, and taxed by Representatives of our own choosing. For though fome wicked Men may have attempted to undermine our Constitution, by base, venal Methods, by Bribery and Corruption, yet we are now affured, that none will be permitted to fit in the House, but they who are properly our Representatives; they who are rightly and duly returned, and zealoufly attached to the prefent Government in Church and State. By this Means our Liberties must be preserved inviolate. As long as the Fountain is kept pure and uncorrupt, the Streams which flow from it must be so too.

The prefent Parliament, being composed of Men of unbiaffed Integrity, Men who succeeded to their respective Seats, by Virtue of the free Votes of their Electors, without the least Prospect of Place or Pension, without any View, but to ferve their King and their Country, must be the properest Guardians of our Rights and Liberties; they must inevitably discharge the great Trust reposed with them in a most faithful and honourable Manner. Through fuch uncorrupt Hands the invaluable Privileges of our excellent Constitution must undoubtedly be transmitted to the latest Posterity, without the least material Alteration or Diminution whatfoever. The Freedom of Elections, M. C-de. that

that great Fundamental of our Constitution, being secured, all is safe; my Person (to borrow a Word or two more of your elegant Phrase) my Estate, my Conscience, my Religion, are all my own.

O felices Anglicani, si sua bona norint!

Thus you fee, Mr. C—de, I can't help following your Example; I can't help ftanding still—making a Pause—and reflecting a little on the wast and surprizing Difference between us and our Forefathers; between us, who are so fortunate as to live under the present happy, and uncorrupt Administration; and our Forefathers, whose Lot was to live in the Reigns of that weak and arbitrary Family the STUARTS*.

here I agree with you, that some of the publick Measures, which were taken in the Reign of K. Charles, were justly Matters of Complaint; that the collecting of Taxes, without Consent of Parliament, was a Stretch of the Prerogative; and a Deviation from the ORDINARY and regular Course of raising Subsidies; and that the Gentlemen, who were sined and imprisoned for not paying them, were severely dealt with.

But admitting all this, what is it to your Purpose? Was his Majesty to be blamed for all these Irregularities? Or, does it follow from hence, that he was a bloody, lawless Tyrant? That during his Government, monstrous Cruelties were daily committed on Persons of high Rank, Qua-

lity, and Learning?

1001

^{*} See Mr. C - de's Letter, p. 110.

Be pleased only to recollect a few Circumstances, and you will find, that his Majesty had not a great deal to answer for, on Account of the Grievances, which are here complained of. You may remember,

That they were the Necessities of the State, which obliged him to have Recourse to such

extraordinary Measures; (see p. 113, &c.)

That though he was obliged to act in the Manner he did, yet he was far from acting in an

arbitrary or violent Manner;

That he advised with the Judges, the sworn Interpreters of the Law, upon the Points in Dispute, and never ventured to collect Ship-money (the Tax which was so much complained of) or, indeed, any other Tax, till the Judges declared the levying it to be just and legal.

That when he was convinced, that Ship-money was an illegal Imposition, he endeavoured, by proper Methods, to make his Subjects easy, and accordingly passed an Act, whereby he divested himself and his Successors of a Power to receive it for ever after; and lastly, you may remember,

That the Gentlemen, who were fined and imprisoned for not paying that and the other Taxes, which were laid upon them, were not fined or imprisoned in an arbitrary, lawless Manner, but, by Virtue of Judgments, passed in Courts of Justice, and in due Form of Law.

Now supposing, that the Judgments, which were passed in these Cases were wrong, was the King to blame for it? Have you never heard of

wrong Judgments in the King's Bench, and Writs of Error granted for examining Causes a-fresh? Have you never heard of Sentences in the Ecclefiaftical Courts fet aside in the Court of Delegates, and Decrees in Chancery reversed in the House of Lords? But is the King anfwerable for all these Errors? Are all these irregular Proceedings and wrong Judgments to be charged to the King's Account?

The very Parliament, in 1641, declared the contrary; as therefore I know you have a very high Opinion of that August Assembly, I will beg Leave to give you their Sentiments upon pute, and never ventured to colled Shi. shahant

In the Remonstrance of the Commons of the 1th of December, 1641, the Loans, Privy Seals, Coat and Gonduct Money, Ship-money, &c. are particularly mentioned as the Effects of Evil Counfellors; and in the Petition, which was presented to his Majesty, and which accompanied the Remonstrance, the Commons protest, that it was without the least Intention to lay a Blemild upon bis Majesty's Royal Person, but only to represent bow his Royal Authority and Truff bad been abused. And finding that the vile Language and Afpersions which they cast upon the King, were generally cenfured and ill spoken of, they afterwards, together with the Lords, in their Declaration of the 19th of May, tell the People, that, if they should say, that all the ill Things done of late in his Majesty's Name, have been done by himfelf, they should neither follow the Direction of the Law, nor the Affection STORE

of their Hearts, which they say, is as much as may be to clear his Majesty of all Imputation of Misgovernment, and to lay the Fault to his Ministers. And then finding Fault with those, who make his Majesty the Author of Evil Councils, they use these Words: We his Majesty's loyal and dutiful Subjects, can use no other Style, according to that Maxim of the Law (the King can do no wrong *) but, if any ill be committed in Matter of STATE, the Council; if in Matters of Justice, the Judges, must answer for it.

* The Sentiments of this Parliament may possibly help us to the true Meaning of that famous Maxim of our Law, The King can do no wrong. It is remarkable, that this Maxim has been ever looked upon as an undoubted Truth, by sensible Men of all Denominations and Parties. In the Parliament in 1641, we find it was universally admitted as such. Could we therefore be certain, that we rightly understood it, we might possibly be able to form a better Judgment of the Nature of our excellent Constitution, than is generally done. A few Remarks upon this Maxim, may at least serve to amuse the Reader, and satisfy him, that the Notions, which some People have of the King and Constitution of England at present, were unknown to that very Parliament, whose Principles and Proceedings they so strenuously espouse, and endeavour to defend.

As to the Sense of this famous Maxim, some Writers, in their Account of it, are extremely weak and absurd. The Meaning of it, according to them, is, that the King can really do no wrong, let him do what he will; that his Prerogative gives him a Power to do what he pleases; in a word, that a Breach of his Coronation Oath, or an Infringment upon the Rights and Liberties of his People, is no

wrong; at least none for which he is accountable to them.

On the other hand, I have met with a Writer or two, who will have it, that this Maxim is rather a Restraint upon the Prerogative, than a Rule in savour of it; the Meaning of it, according to these Gentlemen, is, that a King can do nothing but what the Law allows; that be has no Power, by Virtue of his Sovereignty, to do any thing which is wrong, which is unjust or illegal.

Both these Interpretations, I think, are liable to Exception;

Here you see the Parliament, whose Cause you espouse, expresly acquit his Majesty of all

and the Truth, as in many other Cases, if I am not greatly mis-

taken, lies betwen them.

As to the first Opinion, I think, it cannot possibly be true. For, if the Coronation Oath be of no Force or Signification, why is it given or taken? If the Oath obliges a King to nothing more, than what he was originally obliged to by the fundamental Laws of the Realm, yet still the original Obligation must be binding, and the Force of an Oath must rather enhance than lessent that Obligation. But which is equally material, if a King of England may do what he pleases, what are the great Advantages, which the English Constitution is supposed to have, and which we so much boast of, above those of an absolute Monarchy?

With Respect to the other Interpretation, it is granted, that a King can do nothing, that is unjust or illegal; nothing but what is consistent with the fundamental Laws of the Realm and the Rights of the People. But the Maxim abovementioned does not oblige him to this, neither is it a Restraint upon the Prerogative. It was always understood in another Sense. The Parliament, in 1641, who were no great Friends to the Prerogative, admitted it as a Maxim in favour of Sovereignty, and allowed that the King, by Virtue of this Maxim, had done no wrong, when, at the same Time, they complained, that several wrong Steps had been taken, and several Infringements had been made upon the Rights and Liberties of the People. So that neither this nor the former can, I think, be the true Sense of the Maxim, we are speaking of.

The Parliament just mentioned have plainly hinted at the true Meaning of it. They justly suppose, that a King of England is attended with wife and able Counsellors to advise him in Matters of State, and with Judges learned in their Profession, who are to Interpret the Laws, and determine such Disputes, as shall arise amongst his Subjects. If therefore wrong Judgments should be passed in Courts of Justice, or wrong Steps should be taken in the publick Administration of Affairs, and his Majesty should concur with them, does it follow from hence, that those Errors and Irregularities are to be charged to his Majesty's Account? No: on the other hand, it was wifely confidered by our Forefathers, that, if a K. of England was to be censured and insulted in fuch Cases as these, the Sovereign Authority would be greatly diminished, nor could the Honour and Dignity of the Crown be possibly supported. By the fundamental Laws of the Realm, therefore, the Person and Character of our Sovereign are secured from all fuch Infults and Indignities, and expresly pronounced to

those arbitrary Designs, all that lawless, tyrannical Conduct, with which you are pleased to

charge him.

But that which is still more material, the Grievances, which you complain of, were by this Time all redressed and removed. The King had by all possible Methods endeavoured to satisfy the Demands of his People. He had, besides other Asts, passed an Ast for a Triennial Parliament, i. e. an Ast, which ordained that a

be facred. The facred Person of our Sovereign Lord the King, is the constant Language of our Laws, and the above Maxim declares, that the King can do no wrong; i. e. in the Cases beforementioned, wiz.

If wrong Judgments should be passed in Courts of Justice, or Wrong Steps should be taken in the publick Administration of Affairs, as long as the former were passed in due Forms of Law, and the latter were the regular Advice of the Privy Council, the King is not accountable for either. And in this Sense, the Parliament, in 1641, interpreted the above Maxim. If, say they, any ill be committed in Matter of State, the Council; if in Matters of

Justice, the Judges, must answer for it.

But does it follow from hence, that a King of England can do what he pleases? That he is at Liberty to keep or break his Coronation Oath? That he can trample upon the fundamental Laws of the Realm, and wantonly invade the Properties of his Subjects? Does it follow, that he can do all this, and yet do no ewrong? Is it possible, that the above Maxim can give him such an exorbitant, such a lawless Power? God forbid! Such Acts are a manifest Abuse of all Power; and they, who advance such gross Absurdities, deserve no Answer. In a word, their Notions of Government are below all Contempt, and, if it shall appear, that K. Charles acted in such a Manner, I will readily acknowledge, that he was an arbitrary, lawless Tyrant. - But if, in the most exceptionable Parts of his Administration, he acted by the Advice of his Council, and agreeable to the Determinations of the Judges, the fworn Interpreters of the Law, I would fain know, why he should be excluded the Benefit of the great Maxim abovementioned, which in all Reigns, and by all Men who know any thing of our History or our Constitution, has been interpreted in Favour of Sovereignty.

Parliament

Parliament should be held, at least every three Years, though the King should neglect to call it, in order to prevent the Inconveniencies arising from the too long Intermission of Parliaments.

—An Ast likewise was passed to abolish the Star-Chamber and High Commission Courts, and another to abolish Ship-money, to which last, his Majesty gave the Royal Assent the 7th of August, 1641.

" Much the same Method, says Rapin, was taken with Regard to the other Grievances; and, in the End, there was not a single Grie-

" vance, publick or private, but what was re" dreffed, within the nine first Months of this

" Session; meaning the Session of Parliament

" which commenced Nov. 3, 1640."

Now is it possible, Mr. C—de, to reconcile this Account with the Account which you have given us of his Majesty's Character and Government? Is it possible to conceive, that a Prince could so effectually redress the Grievances of his People, and grant them every Privilege they defired, and yet be that lawless, arbitrary Tyrant, you have made him? Is it possible, that he could intend to subvert the Constitution, and enslave his People, and, at the same Time divest himself of every Power, every Privilege, which must have enabled him to put his Design in Execution? Is it possible, that he could intend to invade their Rights and Liberties, to rob them of every thing, which was dear and valuable, and yet redress every Grievance they complained of, and put it out of his Power to molest them with

with Regard to any Privilege, in which they placed their Security? The Condescention of his Majesty in this Respect, is at least a clear Proof, that he was sensible of the Mistakes of a former Administration, that he desired to redress the Complaints of his People, and secure to them every Right, every Privilege, to which they had a just and legal Claim.

Now pray, Mr. C—de, consider; ought such a Prince to be reproached with the odious Title of lawless Tyrant? Or, is it no Crime to take up Arms and depose such a Governor?

Whenever a Prince, you say, endeavours to subvert a Constitution, and substitute an arbitrary Power in its Room, it then becomes just, reasonable, and necessary not only to resist, but even to depose such a Governor. For in this Case, a Prince degenerates into a Tyrant, and becomes a different Person; and they, who oppose such a Prince, do not oppose their Governor, but an Invader and a Tyrant.

And supposing all this to be true, what is it to your Purpose? Till it appears, that K. Charles was the Tyrant, which is here described, how does this Doctrine of yours affect his Majesty? Or, what signifies your declamatory Harangue upon the Business of Resistance? What signifies your saying over Things, which have been said a hundred Times before? What signifies your telling us, that Tyranny is not Government, and that Princes, who endeavour to enslave their People, degenerate into Tyrants, and may be lawfully resisted and deposed? What signifies all this idle

idle trite Stuff, with Regard to the Point in Debate? Your Business was to prove, that K. Charles was a Tyrant? and not barely to tell us, That wicked arbitrary Princes degenerate into

Tyrants.

You tell us, indeed, That he was a Tyrant; that he endeavoured to subvert the Constitution, and to substitute an arbitrary Power in its Room; and from hence you conclude, that the Opposition of his Subjects, or the Attempts of the People to depose him, cannot with any Colour of Reason or Justice, he called Rebellion. But as you have not hitherto been very successful in the Proof of your Premisses, you will pardon me, if I do not think, that there is any great Regard to be paid to your Conclusion.

Government, you allow, is facred; and good Princes, you say, must not be resisted upon any Pretence whatsoever. Again, to resist Government, you say, is unlawful, and may be reckoned among the most beinous Crimes. But Tyranny is

not Government.

Admitting all this, how does it appear, that K. Charles was a Tyrant? Is it the Part of a Tyrant to endeavour to make his Subjects as eafy and happy as they defire? Is it the Part of a Tyrant to redress the Grievances of his People? To secure to them their just Rights and Liberties, and put it out of his Power to molest them with Regard to their most valuable Privileges? When such Acts as these are found to make a Part of the Character of a Tyrant, I

will agree with you, that K. Charles was a Tyrant; but till this appears, I must beg Leave to be of Opinion, that the Attempts of his Subjects to depose him, were downright Rebellion; and that, after such Concessions made, and such Security given, by his Majesty for the Maintenance of his People's Liberties, they who took up Arms against him, and were concerned in dethroning and murdering him, were, agreeable to the Statute of Charles the Second. wretched Men, desperately wicked, and bardened. in their Impiety.

The Condescension of his Majesty in passing the AEts abovementioned, ought at least to have cancelled the Remembrance of past Miscarriages, nor will you, by all the Art and Difguises imaginable, ever be able to clear those, who, after this Period, appeared in Arms against him, from the horrid Crimes of unnatural Treason and Rebellion. There was now no Pretence for Rebellion; the Grievances of the Subjects were all redreffed, and their Liberties fecured by every legal Method, which

Upon the Principles and Doctrine of the il-Instrious Prelate, to whom you dedicate, they who, after this Time, refifted his Majesty, were, by the Laws of God and their Country, Traytors and Rebels. I beg Leave to rest the whole upon the Words of that cele-

could be contrived for that Purpose.

brated Writer.

I do not blame, fays he, a passive Non-resist-L 2 ance. ance, unless it be when a Society is entirely ru-

ined without Resistance *.

And in another Place, speaking of a Passage in his Sermon, to which some Exception had been taken, he has these Words,—This Sentence is so worded, that it allows not the Lawfulness of redressing Grievances, even in the whole Body of Subjects, before it be certainly true, that their Governors have consented and agreed to enslave them, and make them miserable, and that the Happiness of the publick Society cannot be pre-

served or secured without it +.

Again, referring to another Paffage which gave Offence, he observes, it is manifest this Sentence frees Subjects from Submission, in Point of Conscience, to no Governors, but those only, under whom the universal Happiness of the Society is not secured. Whether this was the Case of the People of England, when their Grievances were all redreffed, when their Liberties were fecured to them, not only in the very Manner which they themselves first proposed, but by every legal Method which could be thought of, without entirely subverting the Constitution, I must leave the Reader to judge. I shall only add a Remark, which the noble Historian has made upon his Majesty's passing the Acts of Parliament abovementioned, it being too material to be omitted.

These Acts, says he, will be acknowledged, by an incorrupted Posterity, to be everlasting Monu-

+ Ibid.

^{*} Mr. Hoadley's Defence of his Sermon, p. 38.

ments of the King's fatherly Affection to his People; and such an Obligation of Repose and Trust from his Majesty in the Hearts of his Subjects, that no Expressions of Duty or Considence from them could have been more than a sufficient Return on their Parts *.

After what has been faid, it may feem needless to take any great Notice of your next Charge, there being little or nothing in it, but what, I presume, has been fully answered already. However, for the Satisfaction of the Reader, I shall lay before him the whole Force of your Efforts against an unfortunate Prince, who, considering the hard Fate he met with during his Life-time, ought now, I think, when a Century has been almost compleated since his Death, to be treated at least with a little more Tenderness, Civility, and good Language, than you are pleased to bestow upon him.

9. You tell us, that King Charles, by numerous illegal and tyrannical Acts, had at length so incensed the People, that he found himself reduced to great Straits and Dissipulties; that therefore on the 3d of November, 1640, he summoned a Parliament, and passed a Bill, whereby he divested himself of the Power of dissolving, or so much as proroguing them, without their own Consent; but that his Compliance in this Respect was so far from atoning for past Miscarriages, that the very Compliance itself was criminal; that he hereby subverted the Constitution of his Country to his own Prejudice, as he

^{*} Clarend. Hift. Vol. I. p. 288. 8vo Edit.

had afore violated it, in numerous Instances, to the Detriment of his Subjects; for though he consented to pass an Act, which looked like a well-meant Concession, yet it seems, that he had no Intention of satisfying the Demands, or redressing the Grievances of his Subjects; that his Designs were still arbitrary and tyrannical; that he fully intended to establish Popery, or something like it; in a word, that he had nothing in his Head or his Heart, but to subvert the Constitution and enslave his People. (Page 14, 35.)

The Reader, I presume, will easily perceive, that feveral Particulars in this Charge have been confidered already, and need no further Reply; and if it shall appear, that the principal Thing which is here objected to his Majesty, is not a great deal to your Purpose; that it rather makes for him than against him; that it is a manifest Reproach to the Parliament, and evidently fixes upon them, the very Charge which you have endeavoured to fix upon the King; if this shall appear, I presume, upon the whole, you will have no great Reason to triumph or boast of those incontestable Facts which were to argue for themselves, and prove his Majesty a lawless Tyrant. I shall therefore lay before the Reader, the full Force of your Reasoning and Rhetorick upon this Occasion.

You say, that in this Parliament (i. e. in the Parliament which met Nov. 3, 1640) his Majesty may truly be said to have reversed his former arbitrary Proceedings (though without any such Intention) by a more unaccountable Step than

any he had yet taken; and to have degraded his Authority beneath every thing even his Adversaries could have hoped for; I mean, by his passing a Bill, whereby he divested himself of the Power of dissolving, or so much as proroguing them, without their own Consent. Thus he subverted the Constitution of his Country to his own Prejudice, as he had afore violated it, in numerous In-

stances, to the Detriment of his Subjects.

When I first read this extraordinary Charge, I was really at a Loss which to admire most, the surprizing Weakness, or the malicious and barbarous Nature of it. As I had scarce ever met with any thing like it, I could think of nothing which fo nearly resembled it, as a Story which is told of the unparalleled Baseness and Cruelty of the famous Colonel Kirk. This Prodigy of Barbarity had an Application made to him by a young Woman, who lived fomewhere in the West of England, and who throwing herself at his Feet, begged the Life of a Father (or Brother) who was concerned in Monmouth's Rebellion. The Colonel refused to grant her Request, but upon Terms the most base and brutal. The Struggles she suffered, between Duty and an Affection for so near a Relation, may more easily be imagined than described. At length, willing to fave a Father's (or Brother's) Life, and not able to bear the Thoughts of feeing him executed, the complied; and, upon a Promise of having her Request granted, gratified the Monster in his luftful Demands. And what was the Consequence? why, the barbarous Villain sneer-L4

ed her for her Credulity and Compliance; and the first Thing (it is presumed) which she saw from the Window of the Room where he satissied his brutal Lust, was her Father hanging on a Sign Post. The Application is too easy to need a Remark.

You would infinuate, that his Majesty's Compliance abovementioned was a Fault; fo was the Compliance of the Girl in Colonel Kirk's Cafe. But is it possible you can excuse the impious Villain, who infifted upon her Compliance, and cheated her of her Virtue? is it possible you can acquit him of being the principal Author of her Indifcretion and Guilt? You tell us, that bis Majesty, by a more unaccountable Step than any be had yet taken, i. e. by complying with the Demands of the Parliament, subverted the Constitution of his Country to his own Prejudice. If fo, pray, Mr. C-de, what Sort of Men must that favourite Parliament of yours have been, who made such a Demand upon his Majesty, and infifted upon his complying with it? Truth, you fee, will come out; and the Subversion of the Constitution, the very Charge which you have endeavoured to fix upon the King, is at length, by a clear Inference from your own Words, inevitably fixed upon the Parliament.

It is plain, that nothing less than an utter Subversion of the Government would content them. The King had redressed every Grievance which they complained of. He had made them greater Concessions than ever were made by any King of England before or fince; nay, greater than

than any Parliament had ever prefumed to infift upon or defire. But all this would not fatisfy them: He must give up his Right to prorogue and dissolve them; a Right which was essential to the Prerogative, and could not be separated from it, without a manifest Violation of the original and fundamental Laws of the Constitution. However, the King, to fatisfy them, that he had no Intention of invading their Liberties, indulged them even in this unwarrantable Demand; and stript himself of a Privilege, the most valuable, perhaps, belonging to the Crown. And what was the Consequence? Instead of being grateful for fuch an unparalleled Instance of Royal Favour and Affection, instead of making a proper Use of the great Trust reposed with them, they abused it to the most wicked and seditious Purposes. The Men who had been brooding fecret Defigns against the Government in Church and State, appear now refolved to carry their intended Schemes into Execution. They now employ every little Artifice to accomplish their End.

In order to incense the People against Episcopal Government, Petitions, by Means the most base and scandalous *, complaining of the haugh-

[&]quot;" It was a strange Disingenuity, says Lord Clarendon, that was practised in the procuring those Petitions; which continued ever after in the like Addresses. The Course was, first to prepare a Petition very modest and dutiful, for the Form; and for the Matter, not very unreasonable; and to communicate it at some publick Meeting, where Care was taken it should be received with Approbation. The Subscription of very sew Hands filled the Paper itself, where the Petition was

ty and oppressive Behaviour of the Bishops, were procured from almost all Parts. And for Fear

" written, and therefore many more Sheets were annexed for the "Reception of the Number, which gave all the Credit, and " procured all the Countenance to the Undertaking. " Multitude of Hands was procured, the Petition itself was cut " off, and a new one framed, suitable to the Design in Hand, " and annexed to the long Lift of Names which were subscribed to the former. By this Means, many Men found their Hands " subscribed to Petitions, of which they before had never heard. "As feveral Ministers, whose Hands were to the Petition and Declaration of the London Ministers, have professed to many er Persons, that they never saw that Petition or Declaration before it was presented to the House; but had signed another, the Substance of which was, not to be compelled to take the Oath enjoined by the new Canons; and when they found, instead of that, their Names " fet to a Define of an Alteration of the Government of the Church, they with much Trouble went to Mr. Marshall, with whom they bad entrusted the Petition and their Hands; who gave them no other Answer, but that it was thought fit by those, who under-- food Bufmess better than they, that the latter Petition should rather be preferred than the former. And when he found, they intendes ed by some publick Act to vindicate themselves from that Calumny, fuch Perfons, upon whom they had their greatest Dependence, were engaged by Threats and Promises, to prevail with them to fit still, and to pass by that indirect Proceed-" ing." (Vol. I. p. 203, 204.)

Befides this, they had Recourse to another Expedient, of such a desperate and dangerous Nature, as none but Men, determined to throw Things into Confusion and overturn the Constitution, could possibly have ventured upon. In order to discourage and deter the Members, who opposed their feditious and traiterous Defigns, from attending upon the two Houses, they countenanced vast Numbers of factious and schismatical People, who asfembled themselves together about Westminster and Whitehall, in fuch an infolent and tumultuous Manner, as perhaps was never feen before or fince. " Those Tumults were at last grown to " fo high Degrees of Infolence, that they spar'd not to invade " the Honour and Freedom of the two Houses, menacing, re-" proaching, shaking, yea and affaulting some Members of both " Houses, as they fancy'd or dislik'd them: Nor did they for-" bear most rude and unseemly Deportments, both in contemp-"tuous Words and Actions to his Majesty himself and the " Court." (Eiken Bafflike, p. 14.) " These Tumults were in-

his

his Majesty's Condescension, in redressing the Grievances of his People, should re-establish

" tended, it feems, to remove all Obstructions in Parliament, i. e. " all Freedom of differing in Votes, and debating Matters with " Reason and Candor. By these the Houses were to be purged, " and all rotten Members (as they pleased to count them) cast out; by thefe the Obstinacy of Men, resolved to discharge " their Consciences, was to be subdued; by these all factious. " feditious, and fchismatical Proposals against Government, Ec-" clefiaftical or Civil, were to be backed and abetted, till they " prevailed." (p. 14). "Yea, fo enormous and detestable were " their Outrages, that no fober Man could be without an infinite " Shame and Sorrow, to fee them fo tolerated and connived at by fome, countenanced, encouraged, and applauded by others."

Rapin himself acknowledges that those Tumults were countenanced and encouraged by the Commons. It is very evident, fays he, that the Commons did not defire hefe Tumults should be so soon end-Again, It is but too probable, fays he, not to fay certain, that they were caused by the Intrigues and Direction of some of the Leaders

of the opposite Party to the King. (Vol. II. p. 404.)

That they were the Effect of the Intrigues of the Party who opposed the King is undeniable. " For though many Complaints were made, and Messages sent, by his Majesty and " fome of both Houses, yet no Order for Redress could be ob-" tained with any Vigour and Efficacy, proportionable to the " Malignity of that now far spread Disease and predominant "Mischief." (Eik. Basilike, p. 16.) "No Order could ever be " obtained, impartially to examine, censure and punish, the " known Boutefeaus and impudent Incendiaries, who boafted " of the Influence they had, and used to convoke those Tumults " as their Advantages ferved." (p. 16.) Cornelius Burges, a Puritan Minister, used to say of the Rabble,

These are my Bandogs, I can set them on, and I can setch them off

"Yea some (who should have been wifer Statesmen) owned " them as Friends, commending their Courage, Zeal, and In-

" duftry."

"When the Lords defired the Commons to join with them " in suppressing those Tumults, and many Members of that " House complained, that they could not come with Safety to the " House, and that some of them had been assaulted, and very ill enter-" tained, by those People that crouded about the Door, some of the " Commons observed, that they must not discourage their Friends;

him

him in their good Opinion; for fear the Differences and Disputes between him and his Parlia-

"this being a Time they must make use of all Friends. Mr. Pym faid, God forbid the House of Commons should proceed in any way to dishearten People, to obtain their just Desires in such a Way." (Clar. Hist. Vol. I. p. 336.)

The Account which the noble Historian has given of these Tumusts, is too long to be transcribed in this Place. I shall there-

fore only trouble the Reader with a Passage or two.

"In the End, the Lords required the Advice of the Judges, what Course was legally to be taken, to suppress and prevent those Disorders; and thereupon directed the Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, to issue out a Writ, upon the Statute of Northmann, to the Sheriss and Justices, to appoint strong Watches in such Places as they judged most convenient, to hinder that unlawful Conslux of People to Westminster, to the Disturbance of their Consultations. Which Writ issuing accordingly, the Justices of the Peace, in Obedience thereunto, appointed the Constables to attend at the Water-side, and Places near about Westminster, with good Watches, to hinder that tumultuous Resort.

"This was no fooner done than the Constables were sent for, by the House of Commons, and after the View of their War"rants, required to discharge their Watches. And then the
"Justices were convened and examined; and albeit it appeared,
that what they had done was in Pursuance of a legal Writ,
directed to them under the Great Seal of England, by the Advice of the Lords in Parliament, without so much as conferring with the Lords upon that Act of theirs, the setting such
a Watch was voted to be a Breach of Privilege; and one of the
Justices of the Peace, who according to his Oath had executed
that Writ, was committed to the Tower for that Offence.

"that Writ, was committed to the Tower for that Offence.

"By this and other Means, all Obstacles of the Law being removed, and the People taught a Way to assemble lawfully together, in how tumultuous a Manner soever, and the Christmas." Holidays giving more Leave and Licence to all kind of People, the Concourse grew more numerous about Westminster, making a Stand before Whitehall, and crying out, No Bishops, no Bishops, no Popish Lords, would say aloud, that they would have no more Porter's Lodge, but would speak with the King when they pleased; and when they came near the two Houses, took Papers out of their Pockets, and getting upon some Place higher than the rest, would read the Names of several Persons, under the Title of Disasfested Members of the House of

ment

ment should subside; all possible Methods were taken to cherish and revive them. The Parlia-

"Commons, and called many Lords false, evil, and rotten-hearted Lords. But their Rage and Fury against the Bishops grew so high, that they threatened to pull down their Lodgings where they lay, offered to force the Doors of the Abby at Westminster, which were kept locked many Days, and defended by a continual Guard within; and assaulted the Persons of some of the Bishops in their Coaches; and laid Hands on the Archbishop of York, in that Manner, that if he had not been seasonably rescued, it was believed they would have murdered him; so that all the Bishops, and many other Members of both Houses, withdrew themselves from attending in the Houses, out of a real Apprehension of endangering their Lives." Clar. Hist.

Vol. I. p. 337, 338.

I shall only make a short Remark or two with regard to these Tumults, which may possibly throw some Light upon the Points in Debate. It is observable, that the Presbyterian and Independent Writers, generally charge the King with invading the Rights and Privileges of Parliament. The Author of the Essay towards the attaining a true Idea of the Character of K. Charles, has a whole Chapter upon the Subject, and yet, I'll venture to say, that there is not a single Fact or Quotation, which he has produced to this Purpose, but what is either unfairly represented, or descient in Point of Proof. But it cannot be expected, that I should dissincely consider what that Author has said, in a marginal Note,

for which Reason I must defer it at present.

But do not such Writers as these forget the great Invasion, which the opposite Party to the King made upon the Honour and Freedom of Parliament, when they countenanced and encouraged the Mobs and Tumults abovementioned? Are there any Acts of his Majesty which amount to a Violation of Parliamentary Rights, equal to the Encouragement which was given to those tumultuous Disorders? Was not the King upon this Account obliged to remove from the City? Were not all the Bishops, and several other Members of both Houses, forced to withdraw? It is most certain they were; nor could they give their Attendance in Parliament without endangering their Lives. Now, whether such a Force upon the Members did not amount to a virtual Disfolution of the Parliament, Mr. C——de himself shall determine.

"When the Army, fays he, by Force, secluded above one hundred and forty Members, they (the Parliament) were after that no Parliament; nor could they in any shape be deemed the representative Body of the Nation. No, certainly. They ment

ment and the People were daily alarmed with fresh Fears and Jealousies, and various Arts were

"were then under the Terror, Awe, and Influence, of a wicked, "military Power, which would admit of no Check or Controul." (Mr. C—de's Letter, p. 66.)

Let us apply his Reasoning to the Tumults we have been speak-

ing of.

When great Numbers were feeluded the House by tumultuous Force, the Parliament after that were no Parliament; nor could they in any shape be deemed the representative Body of the Nation. No, certainly, They were then under the Terror, Awe, and Instunce, of a wicked, fatious, and tumultuous Power, which would admit of no Check or Controul.

This, Mr. C—de, is your own Reasoning, and. I think, can admit of no Exception. By a clear Inference from your own Words, it is plain, that the Commons abused their Trust, and violated the Freedom of Parliament in such an egregious Manner, as to forfeit their representative Character, and degenerate into a tumultuous Faction. This being the Case, is it not amazing that you should talk of the King's invading the Rights of Parliament? Is there any thing like this to be charged upon the Conduct of the King? Yes; the Author of the Essay, &c. tells us, that he invaded the Rights of Parliament in many Instances; that he first bectored and threatened them, and afterwards proceeded to open Outrage and Force. (Chap. vi. p. 36.) And how is this proved? Why, we are told,

"That the King charged some of the Commons (who were undutiful and seditious, not the Parliament in general) with Un-

" dutifulness and Sedition.

"That he called some (who were the principal Incendiaries in widening the Breach between him and his Parliament, and

" who afterwards were guilty of such open Violations of the Honour and Freedom of Parliament, as to forfeit their repre-

- " fentative Character, and virtually to cease to be the Repre" fentatives of the People) he called these Men Vipers and evil-
- " affected Persons, who must look for their Punishment. He

" further tells the Parliament, with respect to Supplies,

- "That as he pressed for nothing beyond the present State and "Condition of his Subjects, so he would accept no less than
- " what was proportionable to the Greatness and Goodness of the Cause, and promised Redress of Grievances, if presented in a

" dutiful and mannerly Way.

"That he would not allow any of his Servants (whom he knew to be innocent of the Crimes with which they were made

made use of to persuade them, that the King was not to be trusted with the Government; that he had still Intentions to enslave them. To this End a formal Remonstrance (a Work which had been laid aside for some Time) was not only resumed and sinished, but debated in the House, with Aggravations highly injurious to the Honour of his Majesty, and at length pub-

"charged) to be questioned amongst them (i. e. he would not allow them to be exposed to the Resentment of their Enemies) and that he wondered at the foolish Impudence of any Man, who should think him capable of doing such a Piece of Injus-

" tice to fuch Servants."

"That if they should not do their Duties in contributing what the State needed, he must use other Means, which God had put into his Hands." And could he do better, than have Recourse to such Means as God had put into his Hands, for the

good Government of his People?

These are some of the Facts, which this Author calls Outrages upon the Parliament; and which, he tells us, were committed by his Majesty in the peaceful Part of his Reign. I do not pretend that the Words which are here made use of, are the Words in which that Author has drawn up the several Charges; but I will venture to say, that they contain the true and real Sense of them; and that the other Charges, which follow in the same Chapter, are equally impertinent and as little to the Purpose, as

will be shewn in the following Pages.

But the King at last, it seems, proceeded to open Outrage and Force; i. e. when he sound that neither Redress of Grievances, or Concessions of any kind, would content the Parliament; that they still proceeded to make fresh Demands upon him; Demands which were manifestly subversive of the fundamental Laws of the Realm, and absolutely inconsistent with his Coronation Oath to comply with; when he found all this, and had observed them seizing the Royal Forts and Casses, and preparing for War, he then, and not till then, had Thoughts of having Recourse to Arms. And was he to blame for endeavouring to defend himself and his People, against unreasonable Men, who had thus openly invaded the Prerogative, and made such traiterous Attempts upon the Constitution in Church and State? I shall add no more at present, but submit the Matter to the Judgment of the candid Reader.

lished

lished and dispersed amongst his Subjects. In this Remonstrance, the Grievances which had been redreffed were all re-capitulated, and the People were reminded of every imprudent Step which had been taken in the former Part of his Majesty's Administration. Thus the Wounds. which the good King had endeavoured to heal, were laid open afresh, by seditious and cruel Men, and left bleeding in a barbarous Manner. Nothing, fays Rapin, would have been more needless than such a Remonstrance, after the Grievances were redressed, if it HAD NOT BEEN INTENDED ON PURPOSE TO QUARREL WITH THE KING, and afford a Pretence to defer to another Time the fettling his Revenues, which was the only Thing that remained to be done, and which the King expected. I have already obferved, fays the SAME WRITER, that there was a Party in the Parliament, who meant not to stop at the Redress of Grievances. this Party that caused the Remonstrance to be resumed, in Expectation the King would be displeased with it, and take some Step that should promote the Execution of their Project. Rapin, Vol. II. p. 385. What that Project was, and who the Party were which are here meant, is too well known to be mentioned.

There were few Members in either House, but seemed determined that past Grievances should be redressed; but then the Views and Designs of those Men were very different. They who were no Enemies to the King were for redressing Grievances, but nothing more; they were

were for leaving the King in full Possession of

his ancient Rights and Privileges.

There were others, who were not only for redreffing Grievances, but for abridging the Prerogative and subverting the Constitution. They were for abolishing episcopal Government, and leaving the King no Power, which could poffibly interrupt their wicked and rebellious Defigns. To accomplish their End, it was necesfary, fays Rapin, to deprive the King of a Power, which they forefaw he would not fail to exert, in Opposition to their Design; and there was no better Way, than by cherishing the Parliament's Distrust, to which the Members, for the most part, were already but too much inclined. They had therefore only to gain a sufficient Number of those who were willing to stop at the Redress of Grievances; and nothing was more proper than to fill them with Fears and Sufpicions. This was the Reason, that such Care was taken to aggravate the Plot for seducing the Army; to dwell continually upon the pretended Defign of bringing them to London; to spread a Report, that a French Army was going to land and feize Portsmouth, with the King's Consent; and I know not bow many other Rumours, equally improbable. This was the Cause of so many Efforts to exclude the Bishops from the upper House, in order to lessen, as much as possible, the Party of those, who were for stopping at the Redress of Grievances. This likewise was the Reason, that so many Mortifications were given the King, to induce him to take some Measures which should give

give an Advantage against him, and be apt to convince the more moderate, that it was dangerous to leave him in Possession of his whole Power.

Rapin, Vol. II. p. 385.

Here you see, Mr. C—de, a Writer of your own way of thinking, one who was a professed and strenuous Advocate for Presbyterian and Republican Government acknowledging, that the Design of the Presbyterian and Independent Party in Parliament, was to subvert the Constitution, and pointing out the express Means, the indirect and villainous Practices, by which their Design was carried on, and at length effected. Now, after all this, is it not monstrously surprizing, that you should talk of the King's intending to subvert the Constitution, which was evidently intended and actually effected by his rebellious Subjects?

Your Reasoning upon this Point is of so extraordinary a Nature, that I need only repeat it, to shew the Strength and Beauty of it. The King, you say, may be truly said to have reversed his former arbitrary Proceedings, but without any such Intention; i. e. if I understand you rightly, he may be truly said to have reversed his former Proceedings without intending to reverse them; he may be truly said to have redressed the Grievances of his People, without intending to redress them; he may be truly said to have put it out of his Power, to distress or enslave them, without intending to

put it out of his Power.

That Mr. C——de wrote his Letter to a Clergyman, &c. without intending to get any great Credit or Advantage by it, may be very true; but that he wrote it, without intending to write it, is what I cannot readily come into. That a Person may take the Oaths to the Government without intending to keep them, and swallow a Custom-House Affidavit without paying any great Regard to it, is very possible; but, if any one should tell me, that a Person took the Oaths to the Government, without intending to take them, I own, I should put him down for

fomething, that I do not care to name.

The whole Truth of the Affair, Mr. C-de. is this. The King had demonstrated his Affection for his People by repeated Acts of Condescension and Goodness. He had redressed their Grievances publick and private. He had fecured to them their Privileges by every legal Method, which could be contrived for that Purpose. After this Period, it is no Wonder, if you found it difficult to acquit those, who took up Arms against him, of the horrid Crime of Rebellion. However, the Cause must be defended at any Rate; the Opposition which was made to his Majesty must not be called Rebellion; our old Friends must not be reproached with the infamous Title of Rebels, and the King must be proved a lawless Tyrant; and one Method which you have taken to prove him fuch, I own, is very extraordinary. When you had not a fingle Fact to lay to his Majesty's Charge, you impeach his Intentions. You infinuate, that his M 2 ConCondescension was a Crime, and his Compliance with the Demands of the Parliament a Subversion of the Constitution. When a Writer, in Defence of a Cause, is forced to have Recourse to such shameful Nonsense, such gross Absurdities as these; when he is forced to call Goodness a Crime, and Condescension, Tyranny, I think I might safely leave the Reader to judge of the Merits of the Cause, and the Integrity of the Advocate.

However, as you are frequently pleased to charge his Majesty with intending to subvert the Constitution, and enslave his Subjects, I will beg Leave to examine the Charge thoroughly. You would make us believe, that when he had redressed the Grievances of his People, his Designs were still arbitrary and tyrannical. Your worthy Predecessors, the Party, who brought him to the Block, did the very same Thing; and Rapin* has honestly told us the Reason of it.

There were few Members in the House, in 1640, but would have been contented with Redress of Grievances. When therefore his Majesty had satisfied his People in that Respect, the Schemes of those, who had other Views, must have been disconcerted, had not the Members, who were inclinable to stop at Redress of Grievances, been alarmed with fresh Fears and Jealousies. The Party, therefore, who had other Views, who had secret Designs of subverting the Constitution, were continually reminding them of past Dangers, and apprizing them of

perpetually telling them, that the Affairs of the Nation were in a dangerous Situation; that the King was not to be trusted; that his Intentions were tyrannical; that he had still Designs to enslave them. As this is confessed to have been an Artistice, which was made serviceable to the Designs of the most wicked and abandoned Regicides, to the Subversion of the Government, and the Murder of the King, is it not something surprizing, Mr. C——de, that you should revive the Charge, and seriously place it to the

King's Account?

I would fain know, what better Proofs his Majesty could possibly have given of his fincere Intention to maintain the Rights of his People, than he did. He redreffed their Complaints, and reinstated them in every Privilege, to which they had a just and legal Claim. And what could he do more? Was he to compliment the Parliament with his whole Prerogative? With the supreme Power, which was invested in him by the fundamental Laws of the Realm? Was he to oblige them with the Subversion of the Constitution, in order to convince them, that he fincerely intended the Support and Preservation of it? Was he, in order to fatisfy the Demands of a few unreasonable and seditious Men, to give up the Militia, the undoubted Privilege of the Crown, and abolish Episcopacy? This he could not do; he had fworn to the contrary. The King in his Coronation Oath (they are your own Words) as much swears to the People, as the M 3 People

People fwear to the King. He swears, that he will defend and support the Establishment in Church and State. He swears, that he will permit the Church to enjoy all her Liberties. This was Part of the Coronation Oath in Richard the Second's Time; and I am assured, by a worthy Member of the present Convocation, a Gentleman well skilled in these Matters, that the same Form, with some little Alterations, hath been continued ever since.

When therefore a Party of feditious Men had openly and deliberately transgressed their Duty. as Representatives; when they were grown fo bold in the Execution of their traiterous Defigns, as to infift upon his Majesty's Compliance with Demands, which was not only inconfistent with his Coronation Oath, but subversive of the fundamental Laws of the Realm, what was his Majesty to do? Was he to pay no Regard to his Oath? Was he to betray the Great Trust reposed with him, and fuffer the Constitution to be subverted? The Resolution of these Questions, Mr. C-de, upon your own Principles, is plain and obvious. In this Cafe his Majesty had a Right to join his loyal Subjects, and stand up in Defence of that Constitution, which he had fworn to maintain.

When a King of England, you say, violates the fundamental Laws of the Realm, and endeavours to subvert the Constitution, he virtually unkings himself; he then becomes a different Person; he degenerates into an Invader and a Tyrant, and may lawfully be resisted and deposed by

by his injured People.—Let us try this Doctrine, and see how it will suit your favourite Parliament.—When the Representatives of the People of England shall violate the fundamental Laws of the Realm, and endeavour to subvert the Constitution, they cease to be their Representatives; they then become different Persons; they degenerate into Invaders and Traytors, and

may lawfully be refifted and displaced.

As this is your own Doctrine, Mr. C——de, I would fain know, why King Charles had not a Right to defend himself and his People against the Parliament. The Parliament had no Right to break in upon the fundamental Laws of the Realm; they had no Right to demand the Militia; they had no Right to abolish Episcopacy, or to deprive the Bishops of their Seats in the upper House. They had no more Right in these Cases (to use your own Words) than the Grand Turk; and therefore the King did not oppose an English Parliament, but Invaders and Traitors.

To enquire, therefore, who first took up Arms, who begun the Civil War, the King or the Parliament, is arrant Trisling and mere Artifice. It is manifestly intended to divert the Attention of the Reader from the main Point in Dispute; it is intended to screen from Observation the seditious and traiterous Behaviour of cruel and unreasonable Men, who first invaded the Prerogative, and made the most lawless Attempts upon the Constitution in Church and State, and then charged the King with levying M 4

War upon his People, whom he took up Arms to defend against the rebellious Designs of those who endeavoured to fix the Charge upon him. The Question, in short, is not, who first took up Arms, but who were the first Aggressors. If you would prove any thing to your Purpose, you must prove, that his Majesty had Recourse to Arms, before he had a just Cause for so doing; before the Parliament had invaded the Prerogative, or attempted to subvert the Constitution. Instead of this, it is notorious that before his Majesty had any Thoughts of taking up Arms, the Parliament had in feveral Instances * invaded the Prerogative and made the most open and traiterous Attempts upon the Constitution in Church and State. The Enquiry therefore (as I faid before) who first took up Arms, is trifling and impertinent. When the Parliament had in-

* Before the King had any Thoughts of War, it is notorious, That the Parliament had demanded the Militia, and would not be content without it.

That they infifted upon an Alteration in the Government of the Church, and were determined to abolish Episcopacy, which the King had sworn to maintain.

That they had feized upon feveral of the Forts, Castles, and

Magazines belonging to the King.

That they had, by Virtue of the Countenance and Encouragement, which they had given to Tumults and Riots, obliged all the Bishops and several other Members to withdraw from the Parliament.

Rapin was fensible of these Particulars, and accordingly acknowledges, "that of all the Witnesses examined against the "King, there was not one, which proved the King to be the "Author of the War." Vol. ii. p. 570. "And yet, says he, in the Charge which was drawn up against the King, he was supposed to have put the Parliament under the Necessity of desending themselves; and this Point, which was the chief, not only was not proved, but even not attempted to be so;" Page 568, Fol. Edition.

vaded

vaded the Prerogative and endeavoured to subvert the Constitution, the King had a Right upon the Principles of his very Enemies, to have Recourse to Arms, and to defend himself and his People against the traiterous Attempts of wicked and seditious Men.

But to leave this Digression, if it be such; though the King had redressed the Grievances of his People, yet it seems, that his Intentions were still arbitrary and tyrannical. But how does this appear? Had he the Character of such a wicked, lawless, bypocritical Tyrant, as this

Objection supposes?

You may remember, I observed in a former Letter, that a Person, whose general Behaviour intitles him to the Character of an honest Man; who upon the whole conducts himself agreeable to the Rules of Honour, Religion and Truth, has a Right to the Esteem of his Fellow-Creatures; that if such a Person should be guilty of some inadvertent Actions, we are obliged to put the most favourable Construction upon them: we are obliged to conclude, (unless full Proof appears to the contrary) that they were the Result of Mistake or Misinformation, of Surprize or Necessity; that either he was obliged to do what he did, or else that he was missed by wrong Advice, and surprized into a Conduct, which he believed to be just and right. This Candour is due to every one, who has the Character of an honest Man.

But if the same Person is made sensible of a mistaken Practice, and endeavours by all possible Methods Methods to fatisfy the Demands of an offended Community, he hath fully attoned for unavoidable Miscarriages, and all injurious Treatment of him subsequent to such a Condescension is un-

generous, base and cruel.

Now if such Treatment is but the just Demand of every the lowest Member of a civilized Community, I hope, the Circumstance of being advanced to a Throne, will not deprive a Person of the same Privilege. The Actions of an anointed Sovereign, who is ordained by God, and to whom his People owe the most solemn Allegiance, have surely an equal claim to the same favourable Construction, which by the Laws of common Humanity, is due to the Conduct of

his meanest Subjects.

Upon this Footing, therefore, I promised to to examine the Behaviour of the Royal Martyr, and see whether he was that weak misguided Bigot, that arbitrary, lawless Tyrant, which you have made him. Accordingly I have confidered several of his Majesty's Actions, and shall now proceed to enquire into the Character which he bore amongst his Cotemporaries. As this unhappy Prince has had the ill Luck to have his Intentions as well as his Actions impeached and misrepresented, it will be necessary to fee what is faid of him by those who knew him personally. I shall therefore lay before you, the Accounts which are given of his Majesty's moral and religious Character, and see whether they can possibly be reconciled with those base, wicked, hypocritical, lawless Intentions.

tions, with which you are pleased to charge him. And here I shall appeal to Friends and Foes, to those who acted against him, as well as those who acted for him, to Presbyterians, and Republicans, as well as Churchmen; and consequently to such as cannot be supposed to

have been prejudiced in his Favour.

The Lord Clarendon's Character of his Majesty is so well known, that it would be needless to repeat it. From that noble Historian, therefore, I shall only transcribe one single Paragraph.—He was, if ever any, the most worthy of the Title of an bonest Man; he was so great a Lover of Justice, that no Temptation could dispose him to a wrong ful Action, except it was so disguised to him, that he believed it to be just. Clarend. Hist. Vol. iii. p. 256.

Dr. Brownrigg, in a Sermon preached in 1644, observes, —— He is a King, who both religiously knoweth and feareth God. Did England ever know a Prince more frequent, constant and attentive in the Worship of God? Survey the World, and see how many (such) Princes, your Thoughts can present you with; surely their Names may be written in a small Compass; we may, and should boast of God's Mercy, all Chris-

tendom cannot afford such another.

Bishop Kennet informs us, that Mr. Alexander Henderson, Minister of the Word of God at Edinburgh, and chief Commissioner from the Kirk of Scotland, to the Parliament and Synod of England, made a solemn Declaration upon his Death-bed, grounded upon the Experience

rience he had in converfing and disputing Matters of Religion with the King, wherein he prays for the good King's being restored to his just Rights; and among other things, fays thus, - I do declare before God and the World, that fince I had the Honour and Happiness to converse and to confer with his Majesty, with all forts of Freedom, especially in Matters of Religion, whether in relation to the Kirk or State, that I found him the most intelligent Man that ever I fpoke with, as far beyond my Expression as Expectation, &c. &c. - 1 obferved all his Actions, more particularly those of Devotion, which, I must truly say, are more than ordinary. If I should speak of his Justice, Magnanimity, Charity, Sobriety, Chastity, Patience, Humility, and of all his most Christian and moral Virtues, I should run myself into a Panegyric, and seem to flatter him, to such as do not know him, if the present Condition I lie in, did not exempt me from any Suspicion of worldly Ends, when I expect every Hour to be called from all transitory Vanities to eternal Felicity; and the discharging my Conscience before God and Man, did not oblige me to declare the Truth simply and nakedly, in Satisfaction of that I have done ignorantly, although not altogether innocently. (Kennet's compleat History of England, Vol. iii. p. 174.)

The Testimony of Mr. Vines, a celebrated Presbyterian in the Time of the Rebellion, is likewise remarkable. At his Return from the Treaty in the Isle of Wight, he said to one Mr.

Walden;

Walden; Brother Walden, how hath this Nation been fooled? We have been told, that our King is a Child and a Fool; but if I understand any thing by my Converse with him, which I have had with great Liberty, he is as much of a Christian Prince, as ever I read or heard of since our Saviour's Time. He also said, He is a very precious Prince, and is able of himself to argue with the ablest Divines we have. He was observed to say further, That among all the Kings of Israel and Judah, there was none like him. (The Irish Massacre set in a true Light, p. 48.)

William Lilly, the famous Republican Almanack-maker, in a Treatife, in which he justifies the Murder of the King, has these Words; He was a perfect Friend; a great Lover of the Clergy, and an Advancer of them; no Courtier of Ladies, nor Frequenter of illicit Beds; he honoured the Virtuous, was temperate in his Diet; not given to Luxury in his Food or Apparel; he was no Papist, nor favoured any of the Tenets. (Lilly's Tract, intituled, Monarchy or no Monarchy in England, printed 1651, p. 83.)

James Harrington, Esq; the famous Author of the Commonwealth of Oceana, used to speak of his Majesty in the highest Terms of Respect. This Gentleman being some Time in the Capacity of Groom of the Bed-chamber, and finding his Majesty quite another Person as to his Parts, Religion, Morals, &c. than what was represented by the Faction, who gained their Ends by Lyes and Scandals, he became passionately affected with, and took all Occasions to vindicate him,

him, in what Company soever he happened to be; but then again, it being sometimes imprudently done, he did suffer for it in those captious Times, &c.—He used to call him a most wife and pious Prince. He would often say to his Companions, that his Death gave him so great Grief, that he contracted a Disease by it, and that never any thing went more near him, than the Death of that most wife and pious Prince. (This Author dedicated his Oceana to

Oliver, Lord Protector.)

You have here, Mr. C-de, the Testimonies of Writers, who were cotemporary with the unfortunate Prince we are speaking of; who knew him personally; who were rather Enemies than Friends to Monarchy, and cannot be fupposed to have been prejudiced in his Majesty's Favour. Now is it conceivable that the bare Affertions of Mr. Rapin, Oldmixon, Neale, &c. or any modern Writers whatfoever, of much better Credit than either, can ever be deemed fufficient to counterbalance fuch incontestable Authorities as these? Or is it possible to reconcile the Accounts which are here given, of his Majesty's inviolable Regard for Piety, Justice, Magnanimity, Charity, Sobriety, Chastity, Patience, Humility, in short, every Virtue, every Qualification, which could make a Prince great and good; is it possible, I say, to reconcile these Accounts, with those base, wicked, bypocritical, lawless Intentions, with which you are pleased to charge him? Here, then, I might safely rest the Cause of the Royal Martyr, and leave the candid

candid Reader to determine, whether his Conduct could possibly deserve the severe Construction which you have put upon it; or whether any, or all his most inadvertent Actions, were sufficient to justify the unparalleled Rebellion

of his Subjects.

But as the *Intentions* of this pious Prince have been impeached; as feveral Writers have accufed him of Infincerity, and will have it, that no great Regard was to be paid to his Word or Promife, it may not be amifs to offer a Remark or two more, which may possibly fet this Matter in a clear Light.

His Majesty, it is well known, made the most folemn Declarations, that he had no Reserves, nor any Intentions of invading the Privileges of

his People, civil or religious.

When both Houses presented a Declaration to him at Newmarket, expressing their Fears and Jealousies, &c. he told them he had his Fears for the true Protestant Profession and Laws, as well as they. For my Fears and Doubts, says his Majesty, I did not think they should have been thought so groundless or trivial, while so many seditious Pamphlets and Sermons are looked upon, and so great Tumults are remembered, unpunished, unenquired into. I still confess my Fears, and call God to Witness, that they are greater for the true Protestant Profession, my People and Laws, than for my own Rights or Safety; though I must tell you, I conceive that none of these are free from Danger.—Again,

God so deal with me and mine, as all my Thoughts and Intentions are upright, for the Maintenance of the true Protestant Profession, and for the Observation and Preservation of the Laws of the Land. And I hope God will bless and assist those Laws for my Preservation. (Rushworth, Well IV.

Vol. IV. p. 528, 532.) His Majesty's most gracious Message to the Lords and Commons from Holdenby, May 12, 1647, is equally remarkable: " His Majesty " (that it may appear to all the World how de-" firous he is to give full Satisfaction) hath " thought fit, hereby to express his Readiness " to grant what he may, and his Willingness to " receive from them (and that personally, if " his two Houses at Westminster shall approve " thereof) fuch Information in the rest, as may " best convince his Judgment, and satisfy those " Doubts which are not yet clear unto him; " defiring them also to consider, that if his " Majesty intended to wind himself out of these "Troubles by indirect Means, were it not easy " for him now readily to confent to, what hath " or shall be proposed unto him, and afterwards " chuse his Time to break all? alledging, that " forced Concessions are not to be kept. Surely " he might; and not incur a hard Censure from " fome indifferent Men. But Maxims in this Kind are not the Guides of his Majesty's Actions, " for he freely and clearly avows, that he holds it " unlawful for any Man, and most base in a King, " to recede from his Promises, for having been ob-" tained

by R. Royston, 1647, p. 2.) *

And why must these Declarations of his Majesty be discredited? why must his Sincerity be

* As his Majesty here solemnly declares, that be held it unlawful to recede from his Promises, which were obtained by Force or under Restraint, it may not be amiss to consider a Passage in Lord Clarendon's History, which has been often quoted by Republican Writers to his Majesty's Prejudice. With regard to the Bill for depriving the Bishops of their Seats in Parliament, Lord Clarendon, say they, infinuates, "that in this and some other Acts of "no less Moment, an Opinion that the Violence and Force used in procuring them, rendered them absolutely woid, insuenced the King to

" confirm them." (Clar. Vol. I. p. 430.)

Now supposing that this Argument (viz. male posita est Lex, que tumultuarie posita est) was made use of to persuade his Majesty to pass those Acts, and that it really influenced him to confirm them, does it follow from hence, that he had no Regard to his Promises? that he intended to revoke his Concessions when it should be in his Power? No; 'tis clear, that he disavowed all fuch mean Prevarication; that be held it unlawful to recede from his Promises in any such Case whatsoever. He might possibly hope, that the Wisdom, Sobriety, and Power of a future Parliament (as Lord Clarendon observes) if God should ever bless the Kingdom with another regularly conflituted, might find Cause to declare such Acts of Parliament word; he might hope, that the tumultuous Manner in which the Confirmation of them was obtained, might induce another Parliament to repeal them; and this perhaps might be fome Motive to him to pass them; but that he intended, by his own Authority, to revoke any Act which he had passed, when it should be in his Power, or that Lord Clarendon infinuates such a Reflection upon his Majesty, is next to impossible. That Noble Writer knew very well, that Maxims of fuch a difingenuous and evalive Nature, were so far from being made the Rule of his Majesty's Actions, that they were his avowed Abhorrence; and accordingly he gives us Part of his Majesty's invaluable Letter to the Prince, wherein are these memorable Words: If God gives you Success, use it humbly and far from Revenge. If he restore you to your Right upon hard Conditions, whatever you promise, keep. (Clar. Hift. Vol. III. p. 230.) Could Lord Clarendon, who knew these Sentiments to be the real Sentiments of his Majesty, infinuate, that his Majesty had no Regard to his Word or Promise? that he intended to revoke his Concessions, when it was in his Power? Credat Judaus Apella. questiquestioned, or so much as suspected? Was he such a base, wicked, abandoned Prince, that his Promises could not be relied on? that he could not be believed or trusted? Writers of all Denominations and Parties, as was said before, Friends and Foes, Men who were cotemporary with his Majesty, and knew bim personally, give a quite different Character of him; they generally agree, that he was a Prince of strict Virtue,

and exemplary Piety.

It is granted, indeed, that some of the Presbyterian and Independent Party charged him with Infincerity, with a fecret Defign (notwithstanding his publick and most solemn Declarations to the contrary) of establishing an arbitrary Government and enflaving his Subjects. It is granted, that Lilly the Republican (who wrote a Treatife, wherein he vindicates the Murder of the King) has faid, that his Majesty had so much of Selfend in all be did, that it was a most difficult Thing to hold him close to his Word or Promise, &c. And can you wonder at fuch Reflections as these from Men of such Principles? When his Majesty had redressed the Grievances of his People, and his Enemies had not a fingle Fact to lay to his Charge, how was it possible they could have pleaded the least Pretence for their horrid Rebellion, had not they had Recourse to this last base and barbarous Expedient? had not they, for Want of Facts, impeached his Majesty's Intentions? It is acknowledged, therefore, that they charged him with Infincerity, with arbitrary Intentions; there being no other Method imagiimaginable, by which they could have given the least Colour of Justice to their cruel and

bloody Designs.

But the Question between you and me, Mr. C—de, is not Whether his Majesty's Enemies charged him with *Infincerity*, but Whether there was any real Foundation for such a Charge. If there was, I presume, it must be built upon one or both of the following Reasons:

1. Because his Majesty had frequently failed in performing his Promises to the Parliament, or at least had behaved in such an insincere and evasive Manner, as to render his Intentions justly

suspected; or advanta blues daidy sus A vac

2. Because in private Life he was found to be a Man regardless of his Word, and not so tender of his Honour as might have been expected, from a Person who was entrusted with the Go-

vernment of a Community.

But if it shall appear, that neither in publick nor private Life he had ever given his Subjects any just Room for suspecting him, of such horrid and hypocritical Baseness; if this shall appear, I presume, the candid Reader will agree with me, that the Charge must not only have been groundless, but base and barbarous; in short, that it must have been a mere Pretence, for carrying on the rebellious Designs of cruel and unreasonable Men.

1. Then does it appear, that his Majesty used to break his Word with his Parliament, or that his Behaviour was of such an infincere and evasive Nature, as to render his Intentions justly
N 2 suspected?

suspected? No; I will venture to say, that there never was the least Foundation for such a Charge:

And,

I challenge you to name a Prince fince the Conquest, who was wont to pay a more confcientious Regard to his Word; who observed a more religious Exactness in performing his Engagements with his People:

I challenge you to produce one fingle Instance, wherein his Majesty ever knowingly or wilfully fail'd to perform what he apprehended he had

promis'd the Parliament:

In a word, I defy you to charge him with any Acts, which could either be call'd properly Breaches of his Word, or Breaches of the Law; nay which had either the Appearance of Insincerity or Injustice (one Act only excepted, which, I know, you will readily excuse, and of which his Majesty heartily repented. I defy you, I say, to charge him with any Acts of this kind, till they were so disguis'd that he believ'd them to be just, or till Necessity oblig'd him to have Recourse to some extraordinary Measures, without which neither the State, or the Honour and Dignity of the Crown, could have been supported.

And if so, what must we think of the numerous Aspersions and Reproaches, with which Rapin, Oldmixon, yourself and others have

loaded his Majesty on this Account.

^{*} The Case of the Earl of Strafford.

† See Appendix at the End of this Letter.

The Truth of the Case, Mr. C-de, is this: The Parliament were at last grown so bold in their Petitions, or rather their Demands upon his Majesty, as to insist upon his giving up that Authority and Power, which was the undoubted Privilege of the Crown. Their Petitions were of fuch an undutiful and feditious Nature, fo plainly subversive of the fundamental Laws of the Realm, that the King could not in Conscience comply with them. His Compliance in many Cases would have been absolutely inconfiftent with his Coronation-Oath: and because he would not always immediately grant or reject fuch Petitions, he is charg'd with Infincerity. Because he would not disgust his Subjects by flatly denying their most unreasonable Demands, nor injure his Conscience by directly complying with them; because he studied to make his Anfwers as agreeable to Truth, and at the same time as obliging to his People as possible, he is charg'd with dealing in fecret Referves, in quibbling, in artful Equivocations, in infidious and evafive Answers, and such kind of Ambiguities, To transcribe all the Instances to this Purpose would be tedious. In the Histories of Rapin, Oldmixon, &c. there are furely enough of them, to which therefore I appeal for the Truth of what is here afferted. Upon a curfory Perusal of those Writers, the Reader will soon be convinc'd, that the Charge of Insincerity upon his Majesty is chiefly, if not solely, founded on the Reasons here affign'd. So that in Fact his Majesty is accus'd of Infincerity, not because be did N3 not

not perform his Promises, but because he would not promise more than he intended to perform; or rather because he would not compliment the Parliament with his whole Prerogative, and confent to the Subversion of the Constitution, which he had sworn to maintain.

Bishop Burnet has a Remark to this Purpose, which is material; and as you have more than once quoted this Author in Prejudice to his Majesty's Character, I choose at least to appeal to him in the Case before us. —— "As to his "Majesty's Fidelity in observing his Treaties, "he says, * I have already mention'd some "Passages, how religiously he resolv'd to observe "them; and his resusing to serve his Interest by Promises, (which how useful soever they might have been to him, yet since he could not with a good Conscience observe them, he "would not make them) show sacred he

This Testimony needs no Remark. I shall therefore leave the Reader to consider whether any thing can possibly be more base, than the Charge abovemention'd, his Majesty having been manifestly accus'd of Insincerity for that, which justly merited him the Character of a most worthy honest Man; for being religiously scrupulous in making Promises, which he could not in Conscience perform.

2. But you have probably other Objections to his Majesty's Character; you will tell us,

^{*} Bp. Burnet's Sermon preach'd Jan. 30, 1674, entitul'd The Royal Martyr, p. 19.

perhaps,

perhaps, that in private Life he was regardless of his Word, and not so tender of his Honour as

became a Sovereign Prince.

In order therefore to give you Satisfaction, if possible, with Regard to this Point, I shall trouble you with a Fact or two, which, I am in Hopes, will put the Matter out of all Dispute.

In a Letter which his Majesty wrote to the Prince from Newport, dated November 25, 1648, and in which he gives an Account of the Treaty in the Isle of Wight, he has, amongst

other Things, these Words:

"If God gives you Success, use it humbly and far from Revenge. If he restore you to your Right upon hard Conditions, whatever you promise, keep. These Men, who have forc'd Laws, that they were bound to preserve, will find their Triumph full of Trouselle. Do not think any thing in this World worth the obtaining by foul and unjust Means." (Kennet's Comp. History of Eng. Vol. iii. p. 165).

These Sentiments, Mr. C——de, must be the real Sentiments of his Majesty, nor can he possibly be suspected of a Design to impose upon the World, the Letter being a private Letter wrote to the *Prince*, and never intended to be

made publick.

I shall only remind you of one short Piece of History more, which I presume the curious Reader will not be displeas'd with; and for which I am oblig'd to the learned Dr. Grey, as likewise for several other Particulars in this Letter.

N 4 "The

"The Night before the King was feiz'd by " the Army and remov'd from Newport to " Hurst-Castle, his Majesty and the few Friends " who were then with him, viz. The Duke of " Richmond, the Earl of Lindsey and Colonel " Cooke, were fully appriz'd of the Defign. "The Question therefore in this desperate Case " was, what was most adviseable to be done. " The Lords argued for the King's attempting " an immediate Escape, for he would better " bring about a personal Treaty with the Par-" liament, (which he fo much coveted) when out of the Reach of the Army, than when " in their Power; and this would certainly fe-" cure the Safety of his Person, which else " might be very probably much in Danger. "But before they could proceed to debate the " Manner of this Escape, the King prevented " it, thus arguing against the Escape itself; first " arguing the Difficulty, if not Impossibility of " accomplishing it; next, the Consequences, " that in Case he should miscarry in the At-" tempt, it would exasperate the Army and dis-" hearten his Friends; and lastly, that if the Army " should seize him, they must preserve him for " their own Sakes; for that no Party could fe-" cure their own Interest, without joining his " with it, his Son being now out of their Reach. " The Earl of Lindsey reply'd, Take Heed, " Sir, lest you fall into such Hands, as will " not steer by such Rules of Policy; Remember " Hampton-Court, where your Escape was your " beft Security, " The

" The Duke of Richmond adding, that he " thought it feafible enough; and turning about " to Colonel Cooke, ask'd bow be pass'd to and " fro? Who answer'd, he had the Word. The " Duke ask'd whether he believ'd, he could pass " him too? who answer'd, he made no Question " but he could; at which the Duke took a " longer Cloak without a Star, and made the " Colonel go along with him through the "Guards, and fo return'd again to the King, " acquainting him with what he had done and with what Ease; and thence took the Advan-" tage again to perswade the King's attempting to escape; who on a sudden turning himself from the two Lords, that were discoursing " with him at the Window, to Colonel Cooke, who stood drying himself by the Fire, said, " Ned Cooke, what do you advise me in this " Case; who humbly answer'd, he suspected his own Judgment too much, to presume to offer any Advice, confidering both the "Greatness of the Danger, and the Person con-" cern'd in it; that his Majesty had his Privy "Council with him, to whom he humbly be-" fought him to liften, observing what they " pres'd him to. At which the Lords re-" fum'd their former Discourse of attempting " an Escape; but the King turning about " again, faid, Ned, I command you to give me " your Advice. At which the Colonel begg'd " Leave, after he had premis'd some Particu-" lars, he might ask his Majesty a Question; " who permitting him, Suppose, said he, I " (bould

so should not only tell your Majesty, that the Ar-" my would very suddenly seize upon you, but w by concurring Circumstances fully convince se your Majesty it would be so; also that I have " the WORD, Horses ready at hand, a Vessel " attending at the COME, and bourly expecting me; that I am ready and defirous to attend " you, and this difmal dark Night, as it were, se fuited to the Purpose; so that I can foresee " no visible Difficulty in the Thing, which I " Suppose to be in all Particulars the true State " of this present Case; the only Question now is, what will your Majesty resolve to do? who " after a small Pause pronounc'd this positive " Answer; They have promis'd Me, and I have or promis'd Them. I will not break first." The Duke of Richmond urging the Colonel

The Duke of Richmond urging the Colonel to speak, he crav'd Leave to speak, to argue the Point with the King, who said, With all bis Heart.

in 'I prefume Sir, (said the Colonel) your Majesty intends by these Words (They and Them) the Parliament; if so, the Scene is now quite alter'd or chang'd, your present Apprehension arising from the Army, who have so far already violated the Promises of the Parliament, as to invade your Majesty's Freedom and Safety, by changing the single Sentinel of State at the outward Door, into strong Guards on your very Bed-Chamber; which is in itself no better than a Consinement, and the probable Forerunner of something more, a speedy and absolute Impriforment."

The

The King reply'd, however, He would not do any thing that should look like a Breaking of his Word; and so bade him and the Earl of Lindsey good Night, and that he would go and take his Rest too, as long as he could. To which Colonel Cooke reply'd, I fear it will not be long. The King answer'd, As please God. The King perceiving great Uneasiness and Disorder in the Colonel, said, Ned, what troubles you? tell me; who reply'd, Sir, to consider the Greatness of your Majesty's Danger, and your Unwillingness to avoid it. The King reply'd, Ne'er let that trouble you; were it greater, I would not break my Word to prevent it, &c.

In the Morning, just at Break of Day, the King hearing a great Knocking at his Dreffing-Room Door, sent the Duke of Richmond to know what it meant; who enquiring who was there, was answer'd, one Mildmay (one of those Servants whom the Parliament had put to the King, and Brother to Sir Henry) The Duke demanding what he would have? he answer'd There were some Gentlemen from the Army, very defirous to speak with the King; which Account the Duke gave the King. But the Knocking encreasing, the King commanded the Duke to let them into his Dreffing-Room. No sooner was this done, but before the King got out of his Bed, those Officers rush'd into his Chamber, and abruptly told the King, they had Orders to remove him. From whom, fays the King? they replied, from the Army. The King ask'd, Whither be was to be removed? they answer'd,

to the Caftle. The King ask'd, what Caftle? again they answer'd, to the Castle. The Castle, faid the King, is no Castle; he told them be was well enough prepar'd for any Castle, and requir'd them to name the Castle. After a short whispering together, they said, Hurst - Castle. The King replied, they could not name a worfe; and call'd to the Duke of Richmond to fend for the Earl of Lindsey and Colonel Cooke. first they scrupled at the Earl of Lindsey's coming; but the King faid, Why not both, fince both lie together? They promis'd to fend for both, but fent for neither; and the Duke of Richmond had order'd the King's Breakfast to be hasten'd, presuming there was little Provision in the desolate Castle; yet, when he was scarce ready, the Horses being come, they hurried him away, only permitting the Duke to attend him about two Miles, and then told him, he must go no further; where he fadly took Leave, being scarce permitted to kiss the King's Hand; whose last Words were. Remember me to Lord Lindsey and Colonel Cooke, and command Colonel Cooke from me never to forget the Passages of this Night.

The Duke return'd directly to the Earl of Lindsey's Lodgings, (on which it appear'd a Guard had been set all Night, to keep him from the Knowledge of what was doing, or at least to confine him from stirring forth had he known of it) and surpriz'd both the Earl of Lindsey and Colonel Cooke with the Account of the King's being carry'd away, with all its remark-

able Circumstances; delivering the King's gracious Remembrance to them both, and his concluding Command to Colonel Cooke. Wherefore while all Passages were ripe in their Memories, "Colonel Cooke, with the Assistance of the Duke of Richmond and Earl of Lindsey, drew up this Narrative in Obedience to the

"King's Command.
"After this, the Duke of Richmond, Earl
of Lindsey and Earl of Southampton, with
his Countes, immediately left the Island, and
embark'd in a Vessel that belong'd to Colonel
Cooke, and landed at Tichsield (the Earl of
Southampton's House) where, just at their
Landing, they were all seiz'd on by a Party
of Colonel Okey's Regiment, who by the Perswasion of Colonel Cooke, and his Engagement
for their Forth-coming, were all permitted
to go to the Earl of Southampton's House the
next Morning.

"The Editor, in his Preface to the Reader, informs us, that among other Relations this of Colonel Cooke's coming lately to his Hands, he did believe it fit to be made publick; because the Account given in it is more particular than any yet extant; and given by a Convert of Integrity, who bare a great Part in the Affair; and also, because it shews, how

" tender a Regard that good King had to his "Word, chusing rather to fall into the Hands of cruel Men, than to give Occasion to the mere Appearance of the Breach of it. If all

" Princes (fays he) were of that Disposition,

"their Faith would more effectually fecure them one against another, than their Arms *."

As this Relation is clear and full to the Purpose, I shall leave it without a single Remark,

and fubmit the whole to the Reader.

Your Account of the Irish Massacre and some other Particulars shall be consider'd in my next; and if I should enter upon some Enquiries, which may not be altogether agreeable to you, you must thank yourself for giving the Occasion. I told you before, that I had met with some infolent Attacks made upon our excellent Constitution, but none like yours. I now appeal to the Reader whether fince the Grand Rebellion, there was ever any thing publish'd of so insolent and weak a Nature, so deserving of publick Contempt and Censure, as what you in your fecond Edition have acknowledg'd to be your own. Your whole Performance could be calculated with no other View, than to revive old Heats and Animofities, and disturb the Peace of that Government, under which you receive the greatest Favours and Indulgences. You could not therefore be juftly displeas'd, if in my next I should enquire,

1. Whether the Methods which you and fome others have lately taken to enflame the Populace and incense them against the present Establishment, be not the very same which were

Certain Passages which happen'd at Newport in the Isle of Wight, November 29, 1648, relating to King Charles the First, written by Edward Cooke, of Highnam in Gloucestershire, some time a Colonel of a Regiment under Oliver Cromwell. London, printed for Richard Chiswell, 1690, p 13, &c.

made use of in 1641, 1642, &c. and by which the Government was at last overturn'd, and the

King depos'd and murder'd.

2. Whether such Methods, which are calculated to disturb the Peace of the Community, can possibly be reconcil'd with that zealous Attachment which you profess for his present Majesty, or indeed with that Gratitude which you owe to the Indulgence of the present Administration.

3. Whether it must not be an amazing Degree of Assurance in such a Person as you, who appear to be so egregiously ignorant of the History of the last Century, to shelter yourself under the Character of the late Sir Joseph Jekyl, and infinuate that a Body of Men (whose great Learning and Abilities have been acknowledg'd by the most eminent Protestants and Scholars in Europe) are quite unacquainted with the History, the Laws, and true Religion of their Country: And,

4. Whether it be not the highest Degree of Insolence in you to take such Liberties with the Names and Characters of some of the most learned Men whom this Nation has bred, when perhaps you had never so much as heard of their Names or the Titles of their Works, had not the voluminous Libel of one of the most infamous Writers*, that any Age has produc'd, or at least a Libel less voluminous †, but equally stuff'd with Misrepresentations, with false Quo-

[192]

tations, and unfair Reasoning, furnish'd you with both.

In the mean time, I shall beg Leave to declare in the Words of a worthy Author, who was bred amongst you, and who still professes a tender and sincere Regard for you, that tho' I am not in Communion with the Dissenters, I bear them no Ill-will. I would no more allow myself in misrepresenting them, than I would desire to impose upon them. The worst Thing that I wish them, is, that they were more happy in understanding their own Interest; and that while they ENJOY EVERY RELIGIOUS LIBERTY themselves, they would learn to be less free with the Characters and Consciences of others *.

Hatton Garden, April, 1748.

adollat

I am, Sir, Yours, &c.

* See a Pamphlet entitul'd, The Question about Conformity to the National Church coolly and impartially examined, &c. London, printed for R. Manby, 1744.

advid oils son ed tientalad

a Lithel left commission

The End of the FOURTH LETTER.

APPENDIX

To the Fourth LETTER;

Wherein is consider'd, The xiith Chapter of The Essay towards attaining a true Idea of the Character of K. Charles the First; the Title of which is, The King's ambiguous and evasive Conduct, and Breaches of solemn Promises.

HE Account which is given (in the foregoing Pages, 179, 180.) of K. Charles's religious Exactness in performing his Engagements with his Parliament, I am sensible, is very different from what is said of him by the Author of the Essay towards attaining a true Idea of the Character of K. Charles. It may not be amiss, therefore, in this Place, to make a sew Remarks upon the Observations of that Writer, and see whether the Facts and Quotations which he has given us, are such clear Proofs of his Majesty's Insincerity and evasive Conduct, as he would make us believe.

In that Author's xiith Chapter, K. Charles is represented as a Person lost to all Sense of Honour and Truth; guilty of the most mean and artful Equivocations, the most insidious and evasive Answers, mental Reservations and Violations of solemn Promises. No Concessions, says he, could hold, no Promises bind him; i. e. I suppose,

fuppose, though he made the Parliament several Concessions, and Promises, yet he did not think himself under any Obligation to perform them, and only wanted an Opportunity to recede from and revoke them. A heavy and heinous Charge indeed! and how is it prov'd? Why in the

It Place, Rapin tells us, That the King, like his Father, was very artful in the Choice of his Expressions; that in his Proposals, it was but too usual to find ambiguous Expressions, Restrictions and Conditions express d or imply d, which made it impossible to build securely upon such Foundations. Again, the same Rapin says, That his Majesty made frequent Use of mental Reservations, couch d in ambiguous Terms, and general Expressions, of which he reserved the Explication till a proper Time and Place.

And who was this Rapin, or when did he write? Was he an Historian who lived in those Times, or did he know his Majesty personally? No; He was a Foreigner, who came into England about the Time of the Revolution; and, it is presum'd, did not finish his History, or bring it down so far as K. James the First, till some time in the Reign of K. George the First. Besides, he was a profess'd Enemy to Monarchy, and a strenuous Advocate for Presbyterian and

Republican Government.

But Facts, you will say, are stubborn Things; and (whether reported by a Native or a Foreigner, by a Republican or a Churchman, by an Historian who writ but Yesterday, or a hundred

hundred Years ago) must determine the Point in Dispute. Very true; provided they are real and pertinent Facts; provided they are fairly represented and full Proofs of the Point, for which they are alledg'd. But has Rapin produc'd any Facts of this kind in Proof of his Affertions? Not one, that is material. He tells us, indeed, that there are several ambiguous Expressions in the King's Papers, i. e. I suppose, in his Declarations and Answers to the Petitions and Remonstrances of the Parliament. And what does he call ambiguous Expressions? why, Expressions which are fo far from being Marks of Infincerity or Breaches of his Majesty's Promises, that they are a manifest Proof of his Affection for his People, and his inviolable Regard for Truth, for his Coronation-Oath, and the fundamental Laws of the Land.

The Parliament, as was observed before, were at last grown so bold in their Petitions, or rather in their Demands, upon his Majesty, as to infift upon his giving up that Authority and Power, which was the undoubted Prerogative Their Petitions were of fuch of the Crown. an undutiful and feditious Nature, fo plainly subversive of the fundamental Laws of the Realm, that the King could not in Conscience comply with them. His Compliance in many Cases would have been absolutely inconsistent with his Coronation-Oath; and because he would not always immediately grant or reject fuch Petitions, he is charg'd with Infincerity. Because he would not disgust his Subjects by flatly

flatly denying their most unreasonable Demands. nor injure his Conscience by directly complying with them; because he studied to make his Anfwers as agreeable to Truth, and at the fame time as obliging to his People, as possible, he is charg'd with dealing in fecret Referves, in quibbling, in artful Equivocations, in infidious and evafive Anjwers. To transcribe all the Instances to this Purpose would be tedious. In the Histories of Rapin, Oldmixon, &c. there are furely enough of them, to which therefore I appeal for the Truth of what is here afferted. Upon a cursory Perusal of those Writers, the Reader will foon be convinc'd, that the Charge of Infincerity upon the King, is chiefly, if not folely, founded on the Reason here affign'd; so that in Fact, his Majesty is accus'd of Infincerity, not because be did not perform his Promises; but because be would not promise more than be intended to perform; or rather, because he would not compliment the Parliament with his whole Prerogative, and confent to the Subversion of the Constitution, which he had fworn to maintain. In a word, he is charg'd with Infincerity, for that which justly merited him the Character of a most worthy, honest Man; for being religiously ferupulous in making Promifes, which he could not in Conscience perform.

2. The next Proof is a Quotation from Coke's Detection of the Court of England, page 93. The King was fickle and unstable, says Coke, cafily put upon Things by his Favourites, and as suddenly altering them and doing quite contrary.

And supposing this to be true, if his Majesty did not promise to be always of one Mind, what is it to the Purpose? If he alter'd his Sentiments ten times in the Day, and was under no Engagements to the contrary, how does this prove that he was guilty of an evasive Conduct, or Breaches of his Word?

3. The next Charge has the Appearance of an Argument; and though it has been fully obviated already (see Pages 139, 140, &c.) it may not be amis to consider it in the Light in which the Author of the Essay, &c. has consider'd it, viz. as an Instance to prove, that his Majesty was guilty of an evasive Conduct and

Breaches of folemn Promises.

The Charge is as follows: His Majesty gave his Royal Assent to the Petition of Right, whereby he bound himself among st other Things, not to raise any Money, by way of Loan, Gift, Benevolence or Tax, without Consent of Parliament, nor to imprison any Person without certifying the Cause; both which Articles he violated immediately after the Dissolution of this Parliament, and continued to do so twelve Years together.

That the King pass'd the Bill, call'd the Petition of Right, and that he hereby promis'd and oblig'd himself not to levy any Tax upon his Subjects without Consent of Parliament, unless an extraordinary Case interven'd, is readily granted. But did he hereby promise not to have Recourse to extraordinary Measures when the Emergencies of the State required it?

) 3.

Let

[198]

Let us suppose that a Person had promis'd his Friend in the most solemn Manner to stay with him three or four Days at his House, would he be oblig'd to be as good as his Word, if his House in the mean time chanc'd to be set on Fire?

Had the Parliament granted his Majesty such Supplies as were necessary for the Support of his Government in an ordinary Way, he had been inexcusable in having Recourse to extraordinary Measures. But as they took Care he never should receive the usual Aids, and laid him under a Necessity of applying to other Expedients for the Support of the State, they had little Reason to charge him with Insincerity or a Breach of his Word.

It has been an allowed Doctrine, that in Case of an Invasion, or the like Emergency, the King has a Power to take the most proper and speedy Measures for the Desence and Preservation of his Dominions and People. It has been allow'd, that when the Publick Welfare is in such imminent Danger, he may command the Aid and Assistance of any private Subject, in order to save the Whole. In Mr. Hamden's samous Tryal concerning Ship-money, this Doctrine was admitted on both Sides; and when the Spanish Armada threaten'd the Kingdom in Q. Elizabeth's Time, it is well known that she made no Scruple to put it in Practice.

When K. Charles had Recourse to extraordinary Measures, "the publick Necessities were "very pressing. His Majesty, besides the Debts

" of his Father and himself, was engag'd in a " very expensive War with two as powerful " Monarchs as any in Europe. Now, in such " a perplex'd State of Affairs, what was he to " do? was he to fuffer the Enemy to invade " and over-run the Nation? was he to fuffer " our Ships to be taken, our Trade to be ruin'd, " and our Country to be expos'd to the Infults " and Depredations of Pyrates and Foreigners? " Had he done so, we should have had Outcries " enough against his Administration. And yet " if the Parliament would grant him no Sup-" plies, how could he possibly defend himself " or his People, without having Recourse to " fome extraordinary Measures for that Pur-" pose ?"

If the Reader will only recollect a few Circumstances already mention'd, he will find that the King had not a great deal to answer for, on account of the Taxes which were levy'd in the extraordinary Ways abovemention'd. It must

be remember'd,

That they were the Necessities of the State, which oblig'd him to have Recourse to such ex-

traordinary Measures;

That though he was oblig'd to act in the Manner he did, he was far from acting in an

arbitrary or violent Manner;

That he advis'd with the Judges, the sworn Interpreters of the Law, upon the Points in Dispute, and never ventur'd to collect Ship-Money (the Tax which was so much complain'd

O 4 of)

of) or indeed any other Tax, till the Judges declar'd the levying it to be just and legal;

That when he was convinc'd that Ship Money was an illegal Imposition, he endeavour'd by proper Methods to make his Subjects easy; and accordingly pass'd an Act, whereby he divested himself and his Successors of a Power to receive it for ever after; and lastly it must be remember'd,

That the Gentlemen who were fin'd and imprison'd for not paying that and the other Taxes, which were laid upon them, were not fin'd and imprison'd in an arbitrary, lawless Manner, but by Virtue of Judgments in Courts

of Justice, and in due Form of Law.

Now supposing that the Judgments, which were pass'd in these Cases, were wrong, was the King to blame for it? Are wrong Judgments in the King's-Bench, and Writs of Error, such unusual Things? Is it not well known, that Sentences in the Ecclesiastical Courts have been set aside in the Court of Delegates, and Decrees in Chancery revers'd in the House of Lords? But is the King answerable for all these Errors? Are all these irregular Proceedings and wrong Judgments to be charg'd to the King's Account? (See this Particular more fully consider'd in the foregoing Letter, P. 139, 140.)

4. The Author of the Essay goes on, and tells us, "That Lord Clarendon (who has expressly afferted, that K. Charles was, if ever any, the most worthy of the Title of an honest Man) has infinuated, that he was a very dishonest

" Man;

"Man; that he had no Regard to his Pro"mises, and that he intended to revoke some
"Concessions, which he made the Parliament,
"when it should be in his Power." But as an Answer has been given to this Charge in the foregoing Pages, (Page 176, &c.) it would be needless to repeat it. I shall therefore leave the Reader to judge whether a Writer must not be greatly distress'd for Facts, when he is forc'd to have Recourse to the pretended Insinuation of an Author for the Proof of a Charge, which that Author has expressly disavow'd, and in Effect declar'd to be false?

5. The next Charge is of so impertinent and rude a Nature, and sounded upon such arrant Falshoods, at least such a base Misrepresentation of known Facts, that I had once Thoughts of passing it by, and treating it with the Contempt it deserves.

"The Parliament, says the Author of the Essay, "could have no Opinion of the King's "Veracity, because they had been induced to advise a War with Spain by mere Artifice and "Cunning; and by a Narrative of the Duke of Buckingham, salse in every Particular, tho' attested by King Charles when Prince.—
"The Earl of Bristol plainly shew'd, before the House of Lords, how much Buckingham had impos'd upon the Parliament in his Narrative of what pass'd in Spain. This result of the King himself, who had not only attested the Relation, but persisted still

" to attest it as true; though the Earl had in-"contestably prov'd it to be false." (Rapin,

Vol. X. pag. 29, 68.)

As here are different Facts confounded and blended together, it will be necessary to separate and consider them distinctly. Admitting then, that the Parliament were induc'd to advise a War with Spain by some artful Suggestions in the Duke of Buckingham's Narrative, does it follow from hence that the whole Narrative was false, or, as the above Writer is pleas'd to word it, false in every Particular?

Was it not true, that the Prince and the Duke took a Journey to Spain, in order to make a clear Discovery of the Sincerity of the Spaniard, and either to put a speedy End to the

intended Match, or break it off?

Was it not true, that the Court of Spain had trifled with King James for several Years, and only amus'd him with Promises of an intended Match between the Infanta and the Prince of Wales, by Reason of the Situation of Affairs in the Palatinate and Netherlands?

Was it not true, that there never had been any real Defign (till Philip the Fourth's Time) that the Infanta should be given the Prince? (See Rapin, Vol. II. page 219.)

Was it not true, that after this Period, feveral new Difficulties were flarted, in order to

put off, and delay the Affair?

Was it not true, that during the Prince's Abode in Spain, the Court never procur'd the Dispensation from Rome, which might easily have

have been done, and that upon the Death of Pope Gregory XV. the whole Process was to

begin again?

Was it not true, that new Demands, and fresh Difficulties were insisted upon with regard to Religion? that the principal Clergymen, and the most eminent of the King of Spain's Preachers, had frequent Conferences with the Prince, to persuade him to change his Religion, and become a Papist? and, in order to move him the

more fuccessfully thereunto,

Was it not true, that they procur'd the Pope to write a Letter himself to his Highness, putting him in Mind of the Religion of his Ancestors and Progenitors, and conjuring him to return to the same Faith; but that it pleased God not only to give the Prince a constant and unshaken Heart in his Religion, but such wonderful Abilities to defend the same in his Discourse and Arguments, that they stood amaz'd to hear him, and upon the Matter confess'd, that they were not able to answer him?

Was it not true, that they would not suffer the Prince to confer with, or so much as to speak to, hardly and very rarely to see his Mistress, whom they pretended, he should forth-

with marry?

Was it not true, that they could never obtain any better Answer in the Business of the Palatinate, than that the restoring it was not in the Power of that King? (See Clarend. Vol. I. p. 20, 21.)

As these several Particulars are generally allow'd to be true, so we are affur'd, that they were, at least (some Aspersions upon the Earl of Bristol excepted) the Substance of the Duke's Narrative; and yet, if we will take the Author of the Essay's Word for it, the Duke's Narrative was false in every Particular, and incontestably prov'd to be false by the Earl of Bristol.

The Earl of Bristol does not, (as far as I can learn) either in his Defence, or his Charge against the Duke of Buckingham, offer any Proofs which appear to be fufficient, or which were intended to invalidate the Truth of the Articles abovemention'd. He excepts indeed to the first Article; but here the Earl is prefum'd, by Rapin

himself, to have fail'd in his Proof.

"Others pretend, fays Rapin, that Bucking-" bam's Aim was not (as the Duke alledg'd in " his Narrative) to discover, whether the Court " of Spain were sincere in their Designs, but in-" fenfibly to induce the Prince to change his " Religion, by exposing him to all the Temp-" tations, which of course he would meet " with at the Court of Madrid. — But the " Proofs on which the Earl of Briftol grounded his Accusation, were but Presumptions at " most; and as he was a profess'd Enemy to " the Duke of Buckingham, I do not know " whether his Testimony may be relied on." (Rapin's Hist. Vol. II. p. 220. fol.)

Now if the Substance of the Narrative was true, how did his Majesty, by attesting it, violate his Henour, or give the Parliament the least Reason to have an ill Opinion of his Ve-

racity?

The Earl of Bristol, it is granted, excepted to several Aspersions, which the Duke in his Narrative would have six'd upon him, and which, as Lord Clarendon intimates, were ground-

less.

But might not the Prince have other Sentiments of the Earl's Behaviour? Might not he have Reason to believe, that there was some Foundation for those Aspersions? Might not the Duke, that Great Statesman, (who was capable of influencing the Parliament to advise a War with Spain by mere Artifice and Cunning) impose upon the Prince with regard to these Particulars, and persuade him, that what he suggested against the Earl, was true? It is almost certain that he did. The Earl himself has acknowledg'd as much. He has intimated, that feveral Circumstances had been misrepresented to his Majesty, and that others in his Favour had been conceal'd from him. He bop'd, he said, to justify his Petition in such sort, as should not displease his Majesty - by reducing into his Memory divers Circumstances, and laying before him the Passages of divers Particulars, which by undue Practices had been either conceal'd from his Majesty or misrelated unto him. Now upon the whole what does this great Charge amount to? or how does it affect his Majesty's Veracity? The King attested the Truth of the Duke's Narrative, which, as to the Substance of it, appears to have been true, though it is

Particular. And with regard to that Part of it, which related to the Earl of Bristol, it is more than probable, that the King was impos'd upon; that several Circumstances concerning the Earl's Behaviour, were so disguis'd by the Duke, that the King believ'd the Duke's Representation of it to be just and true. And is not this a notable Instance, to prove, that the King had no Regard to his Word? A Writer, who is forc'd to have Recourse to such instances Misrepresentations for the Proof of a Charge (the Reader, I believe, will agree with me) must be

greatly distress'd.

6. The two next Charges are Quotations from Lord Clarendon; and the Manner in which they are made is such, as is manifestly calculated to mislead the unskilful Reader, and make him believe, that the Facts referred to, are Facts related and admitted as true by that Noble Historian. The Author of the Essay, in his Preface, addresses his Readers in the most pompous and artful Words. The Method, fays he, here taken will be thought, it is prefum'd, most likely to come at the Knowledge of the Truth; which is to call, as it were, a Council of the most celebrated Historians and Writers of THOSE TIMES, and to give the Reader the Satisfaction of bearing them stand forth, and each in his OWN Words pronouncing upon the Case. After such a Declaration, when we find this Writer quoting Lord Clarendon for the Proof of a particular Charge against K. Charles, what are we

to conclude, but that the Passages quoted from him are Facts admitted, and related as such by that noble Historian? Is it conceivable, that he would quote him for the Proof of a Fact, which his Lordship has expressly declar'd to be salse, and clearly prov'd to be so? And yet, upon Examination, it will be found, that the sollowing Charges are both of this kind; Charges, which are only mention'd to be consuted, and which Lord Clarendon himself hath consuted beyond all Possibility of a Reply.

The Imputations are, that his Majesty was guilty of Breaches of his Word in two Respects,

I. In accusing of High-Treason the Lord Kimbolton, and sive of the Members of the House of Commons; in going to the House with an armed Force, and requiring them to be taken into Custody; whereas not two Days before, when he had given Directions for their Accusation, the House had received from him a gracious Message, that he would always have (the same) Care of their Privileges, as of his own Prerogative, and of the Safety of their Persons, as of his own Children.

2dly, In being privy to a Resolution taken by some People of bringing up the Army to London, when at the same Time, he call'd God to witness, that he never had any such Thought, or

knew of any such Resolution.

As the Author of the Essay refers to Lord Clarendon for both these Charges, it may not be amiss to lay before the Reader, that illustrious Author's Sentiments upon each of them.

As to the first Charge, the noble Historian has clearly shewn, that his Majesty was so far from being guilty of a Breach of his Word, that he did nothing in the Affair of the five Members but what was at least warrantable; nothing but what his Sovereign Character authoriz'd him to do, and what was justifiable by Precedents of Parliament and the Laws of the Realm.

"That any Members, of either House, (says he) may be prosecuted in the same Manner, as if they were not Members, in the Case of Treason or Felony, is so known a Truth, that no Man (who pretends to know the Laws of the Kingdom, or Precedents of Parliament) ever thought the contrary, or heard the contrary faid, till since the Case of these Members; and the same hath been always acknowledg'd in all Parliaments, and may be faid to be acknowledg'd by this (the long fets it down as a Maxim, in his Chapter of the High Court of Parliament, which was

" Commons, fince this Parliament began. (See 4 Part, Instit. fol. 25.)

of printed by the special Order of the House of

"That the King had Reason to accuse these "Members of High-Treason, can be as little doubted, since he could make particular Proof against them, of a solemn Combination enter'd into by them for altering the Government of the Church and State; of their solliciting and drawing down the Tumults to Westminster, "and

" and of their bidding the People in the Height " of their Rage and Fury to go to Whitehall; " of their scornful and odious Mention of his " Majesty's Person, and their Design of getting " the Prince into their Hands; and of their treating with foreign Power to affift them, if " they should fail in their Enterprizes. And " why the King's Attorney, upon these Rea-" fons, might not as lawfully accuse those " Members of High-Treason, as the Attorney-"General, in the first Year of this King's " Reign, did accuse the Earl of Bristol upon " a Charge more general, who was thereupon committed to the Tower; and why his Ma-" jesty might not as well have expected, that " upon his Articles (not so general as a mere " verbal Accufation) of High-Treason, either " House would have committed their several " Members, as they had done fo many this " Parliament; and about that Time twelve Bi-" shops together (upon a confess'd Ground, " which every Man there, who knew what "Treason was, knew that Fact to be none) " merely because they were accus'd, his Majesty " (upon Occasion of mentioning this Passage) " fays, He could neither then, nor yet can, un-" derstand.

"This being the Case, there remains no-"thing but his Majesty's own going to the "House, for which, hear his own Words, in "his Answer to the Declaration of the 19th of "May, where that Matter was loudly laid to "his Charge.

P

When we resolv'd, that it was fit for our " own Safety and Honour, and the Peace of the " Kingdom, to proceed against those Persons, " though we well knew there was no Degree of " Privilege in that Case, yet (to shew our De-" fire of Correspondence with the two Houses of Parliament) we chose rather than to appre-" bend those Persons by the ordinary Ministers " of Justice (which according to the Opinion and " Practice of former Times we might have done) " to command our Attorney-General to acquaint " our House of Peers with our Intention, and " the general Matters of our Charge (which was " yet more particular than a meer Accusation, " and to proceed accordingly; and at the same " Time sent a sworn Servant, a Serjeant at " Arms, to our House of Commons, to acquaint " them, that we did accuse, and intend to pro-" secute the five Members of that House for " High-Treason; and did require that their Per-" fons might be secur'd in Custody. This we did, not only to shew, that we intended not to " violate or invade their Privileges, but use " more Ceremony towards them, than we con-" ceiv'd in Justice might be requir'd of us, " and expected at least such an Answer, as " might inform us, if we were out of the " way. But we receiv'd none at all; only in " the Instant, without offering any thing of " their Privileges to our Confideration, an Or-" der was made, and the same Night publish'd " in Print, that if any Person whatsoever " Should offer to arrest the Person of any Mem-" ber

" ber of that House, without first acquainting " that House therewith, and receiving further " Order of the House, that it should be lawful " for fuch Members, or any Person to affift them, " and to stand upon his or their Guard of De-" fence, and to make Refistance according to the " Protestation taken to defend the Privileges of " Parliament; and this was the first Time we " heard the Protestation might be wrested to " fuch a Sense, or that in any Case (tho' of the " most undoubted and unquestionable Privilege) " it might be lawful for any Person to refist and " to use Violence against a publick Minister of " Justice arm'd with lawful Authority; though " we well knew, that even fuch a Minister " might be punish'd for executing such Autho-" rity. Upon viewing this Order, we must " confess we were somewhat amaz'd, having " neither seen nor heard of the like before, tho " we had known Members of either House com-" mitted, without so much Formality as we had " used, and upon Crimes of a far inferior Na-" ture to those we had suggested. And having " no Course propos'd to us for our Proceeding, " we were upon the Matter only told, that " against those Persons we were not to proceed " at all, that they were above our Reach of the " Law. It was not easy for us to resolve what " to do, if we employ'd our Ministers of Jus-" tice in the usual Way for their Apprehension (who without Doubt would not have refus'd to have executed our lawful Commands) we " Saw what Refistance and Opposition was like

to be made, which very probably might cost " some Blood; if we sat still, and defisted upon " this Terror, we should at the best have con-" fess'd our own Want of Power, and the Weak-" ness of the Law; in this Strait we put on a " fudden Resolution to try whether our own Pre-" sence and clear Discovery of our Intentions " (which haply might not have been so well un-" derstood) could remove those Doubts, and pre-" vent those Inconveniences, which seem'd to be " threaten'd. And thereupon we resolv'd to go " in our own Person to our House of Commons, " which we discover'd not till the Minute of our " going, when we fent out, that our Servants " and such Gentlemen as were then in our " Court, should attend us to Westminster, but " giving them express Command, that NO Ac-" CIDENTS OR PROVOCATION SHOULD DRAW " THEM TO ANY SUCH ACTION, AS MIGHT " IMPLY A PURPOSE OF FORCE IN US, and " Ourself (requiring those of our Train not to " come within the Door) went into the House of " Commons, the bare doing of which, we did " not conceive would have been thought more a Breach of Privilege, than if we had then ss gone to the House of Peers, and sent for them to come to us, which is the usual Custom. " This was his Majesty's Answer formerly to " this Charge, which is therefore here inferted " at large, as being fo full, that nothing need " be added; and it appeared by the Depositions " of Barnard Ashly and others taken by them, " that the King gave his Train express and pocs fitive I

" fitive Charge, That they should give no Of-

" cation soever they met with; which Depositions were carefully suppress'd and conceal'd,

"whilst they made Use of the Testimony of

" indigent and infamous Fellows, to reproach

" his Majesty, from some light and unadvis'd

"Discourse, which was pretended to be utter'd by some young Gentlemen, who had put

" by some young Gentlemen, who had themselves into the Train *."

After the foregoing Remarks, what must we think of a Writer, who has taken such artful and difingenuous Pains to fet his Majesty's Conduct in the most odious Light? who has reprefented his going to the House, as if he had been going to storm and take Westminster by Force? ____ as an unparallel'd Breach of Parliamentary Privilege; as an Action of the most violent and hostile Nature? He burst, fays he, into the House at the Head of his little Army, (with fuch Violence and inconsiderate Precipitancy) as to pull down the Fabrick of our Constitution about his Ears, and bury himself in the Ruins of it? What, I say, must we think of a Writer so absolutely void of Truth, of Honour, and common Modesty?

He who presumes to charge a Sovereign Prince, or, indeed, any Man of Character, with Infincerity and an evalive Conduct, should at

^{*} See Sir Edward Hyde's Answer to an infamous and traiterous Pamphlet, intitul'd, A Declaration of the Commons, &c. Printed Feb. 15, 1647.

leaft take Care to stand clear of such Imputations himself. But the true Spirit of 1641, 1642, &c. we may now venture to fay, is manifestly reviv'd. When the subsequent Conduct of the five Members had made a fuller Discovery of their rebellious and traiterous Intentions, considerate Men imagin'd that the Faction would have been asham'd to have remember'd the Affair of his Majesty's going to the House, and endeavouring to secure a Set of Men, who now openly appear'd to be Rebels and Traitors. "Tho' the " Tale of the Members (fays Sir Edward Hyde) " did at that Time serve their Turn, to work " upon the unskilful and undistinguishing Minds of the People, and to apply them to their Ser-" vice, it was believ'd, they would now have " blush'd to have remember'd it, fince as dif-" cerning Men were not at that Time, in any " Degree satisfy'd of their Innocence, so all " Men, by the Demeanour of those Members " afterwards, have concluded, that the King " had very good Reason then to accuse them." But the Notoriety of their Guilt had little Weight with fome People; they still charg'd his Majesty with invading the Privileges of Parliament; and it is remarkable that at the End of above a hundred Years, the same Charge is again reviv'd, with as much Virulence as ever.

2. His Majesty is further charg'd with being privy to a Resolution taken by some Officers, &c. of bringing up the Army to London, when at the same Time, he call'd God to witness, that he never had any such Thought, or knew of any such

fuch Refolution; which must seem strange (say the Parliament) (and even incredible, says the Author of the Essay) (for this is an Addition of his own) to those who should read the Deposition and Examinations of Goring, Piercy, Wilmot, Pollard, Leg, &c. and consider the Nature of the Petition sent to Sir Jacob Ashley, sign'd C. R. Charles Rex, which his Majesty had now acknowledg'd to be his own Hand—and to have been deliver'd by himself to Captain Leg.

But why must the King's Declaration seem incredible, or even strange? Does the Petition sign'd C. R. shew it to be such? or do the Depositions of the Gentlemen above-mention'd prove any such Thing? No; so far from it, that from the Petition and the Depositions, i. e. from the Evidence which the Parliament themselves produc'd, it is clear beyond all Contradiction, that his Majesty knew nothing of the Design, with which he was charg'd. It would be tedious as well as needless to transcribe the whole Account of this Affair, for which Reason I shall only trouble the Reader with a short Remark or two, and refer him for further Satisfaction to Lord Clarendon himself *.

The Reader is only defir'd impartially to con-

fider the following Particulars;

1. That the Petition which is urg'd as a Proof of this Charge, and which is recited at large by Lord Clarendon +, is fo far from being

^{*} Clarendon's History, Vol. I. B. iii, page 244. 840. Edit. † Ibid. page 245.

a Proof of that, for which it is alledg'd, that it appears to be a Petition of a very modest, in-

offensive and dutiful Nature.

2. That at a Meeting of some Officers and others of his Majesty's Servants, (the only Time when the bringing up the Army to London was mention'd) he was so far from being privy to a Resolution of this kind, that, it is evident, from what pass'd at that Meeting, there never was any fuch Resolution or Design form'd at all. For no sooner had a certain Person (Col. Goring) made a Motion to that Purpose, but the Motion was rejected with the utmost Contempt and Detestation. "There was not (as I have been credibly inform'd, fays Lord Clarendon) " a " Man in the Company, that did not perfectly " abhor (or feem'd fo to do) that odious Pro-" position; but contented themselves with mak-" ing such Objections against it, as render'd it ri-" diculous and unpracticable."

3. That as to the Depositions and Informations of Colonel Goring, Mr. Piercy, &c. the Parliament took Care to publish only such Parts of them as contributed most to their Purpose. "For the Truth is, as they never publish'd so much as to the Houses, which were to judge, many Depositions of Witnesses, whose Testimonies in a manner vindicated the King from those Aspersions, which they had a

" mind should stick upon him (for many such there were) so of those which they did pub-

" lish, they lest out many Parts, which being added, would either have obscur'd, or con"tradicted,

" tradicted, or discredited much of that, out of " which they made the People believe much to " the King's Differvice." (Clarend. Hift. Vol. I.

" p. 567.

4. That, notwithstanding all those Arts and Omissions, it appear'd from the Depositions, which they themselves publish'd, by the Order

of the 10th of May, 1640,

That this dangerous Plot, as they call'd it, began without the least Privity of the King; that the Resolution which the Officers came to. was nothing more than to tender their Services to his Majesty in all Things honourable and agreeable to the fundamental Laws of the Kingdom:

That when Mention was made of bringing up the Army to London and making fure the Tower, it was no sooner propos'd, than rejected;

That when the King was made acquainted with it, he said, Those Ways were vain and foolish, and that they should think of them no more. The Reader will confider, that all this appear'd from their own Evidence, viz. from the Depositions and Informations of Goring, Piercy, &c. which the Parliament published.

5. The Reader will please to consider further, that Mr. Piercy's strict Regard to Truth might justly be question'd, his Letter having been extorted from him, after he had fworn not to divulge the Affair, and upon Condition he might be permitted to make his Escape into France. " Mr. Pym confented that he should escape into " France, upon Condition the Earl of North-

" umberland

" umberland would draw such a Letter from

" him, as might by the Party be apply'd as an "Evidence of the Reality of the Plot after he

" was escap'd. In this Manner, says Lord Cla-

" rendon, the Letter was procur'd, which made

" a lasting Quarrel between the two Brothers."

6. But what is fill more remarkable, Captain Chudleigh, who is faid to have been employ'd by the King to tamper with and incense the Army against the Parliament, there is great Reason to believe, was a Creature employ'd by the Parliament themselves to act that extraordinary Part, and afterwards produc'd as an Evidence in Prejudice to the King. " It was ob-" ferv'd, fays Sir Edward Hyde, and not a lit-" tle wonder'd at, that Captain Chudleigh, who " was the principal Person employ'd, and who confesses in his Examination of the 10th of " May, that he us'd all his Power to incense " the Army against the Parliament, and to kin-" dle a Zeal in them towards the King, was fo " far from being in Disfavour with them, that " he was immediately employ'd by them in " Ireland, and afterwards recall'd thence, and " trusted in the second, if not the first Com-" mand in the West against the King, which " they would not have done, if he had been " in that Manner first engag'd by his Majesty."

I shall only add a Passage from Lord Clarendon, and another from Rapin, and leave the Reader to judge, whether the above Charge can in the least affect the King's Honour or Veracity.

" For ought I could ever observe, says Lord Clarendon, "by what was afterwards reported in " the House of Commons, or could learn from " those, who were most conversant with all the " Secrets of that Delign, there was never the " the least Intention of working farther upon " the Affections of the Army, than to preserve " them from being corrupted or made use of, " for the impoling unjust and unreasonable " Things upon the King; and all that the "King ever fo much as confented should be " done by them, was, that as most Counties in " England or rather, the factious and seditious " Persons in most Counties, had been induc'd " to frame and subscribe Petitions to the Par-" liament, against the establish'd Government " of the Church, with other Clauses scandalous " to the Government of the State too, fo the " Officers of the Army too, should subscribe a " Petition; and accordingly a Petition was brought " ingross'd to his Majesty for his Approbation, " before they would prefume to recommend it " to any for their Subscription." Clarendon's History, Vol. I. p. 245.) We have here the Testimony of a Writer,

who was then Member of the House of Commons, and must know the Truth of the Affair much better than Rapin, Oldmixon, or any other modern Writer of more Importance than

either.

Rapin, indeed, feems to be doubtful whether it was a real Plot or no. For whatever his violent Attachment to a particular Party of Men

may have induc'd him to fay in other Parts of his History, it is plain, he was inclinable to think, that this was an Affair at least aggravated to serve a Turn.

"When it is consider'd, says he, in what "Juncture this Conspiracy was discover'd to the House, tho' Mr. Pym was inform'd of it "long before; that it was at a Time, when the "Pers were in some Measure compelled to pass the Bill of Attainder against the Earl of "Strafford; and when the Rabble were also using Violence for that Purpose, there seems to be Ground to suspect, that it was only an Artistice to stir up the People, and induce the "Lords to do as the Commons desir'd, from a "Fear of the imminent Danger the Kingdom was threaten'd with; at least there is Reason to believe, this Conspiracy was greatly aggravated." (Rapin, Vol. II. p. 369.)

7. The Purport of the following Charge is, that K. Charles was guilty of infidious and double Dealing as to the Papists. Several Instances are cited from Rapin, Oldmixon, Neal, &c. to support this Charge; but whether any or all of them are greatly to the Purpose, the Reader, after a few Remarks, must be left to determine.

His Majesty, it is granted, made several Promises and Protestations, that he would support and maintain the true Protestant, reform'd Religion, and put the Laws in Execution against Papists and Recusants.—And how does it appear that he was worse than his Word? Did he

ever encourage Popery, or shew any particular Favour to Delinquents of that Profession? Did he obstruct the Course of Justice, or hinder the Laws from being put in Execution against them? No; on the other hand, it is notorious, as hath been observed in a former Letter *,

That he had the Interest of the Protestant

Religion fincerely at Heart;

That he was so far from dispensing with the Laws against Papists, that he gave strict and repeated Orders, that the Laws should be put severely in Force against them;

That accordingly they were put in Force

against them; and

That no less than a hundred and twenty of the Queen's Servants were oblig'd to leave the

Kingdom at one Time.

This being the Case, let us suppose, that upon some extraordinary Occasions, his Majesty thought proper to extend his Mercy to a sew Popish Delinquents; that he releas'd them out of Prison and granted them their Pardons; Was he for this, chargeable with a Breach of his Word? with insidious and double Dealing? A King of England, we know, at his Coronation, promises that he will punish all Injustice; that he will put the Laws in Execution against all Criminals whatsoever. But supposing, for good Reasons, he should think fit to extend his Mercy to a condemn'd Felon, are we immediately to charge him with a Breach of his Words? Has

^{*} Letter II. p. 59-

not fuch a Power been always deem'd a Branch

of the Prerogative?

It is admitted, that upon the Queen's Arrival in England, Profecutions against Papists were stop'd, and that several Popish Delinquents were releas'd out of Prison, for which good Reasons have been assign'd already; but does it follow from hence, that his Majesty was guilty of a Breach of his Word? that he encourag'd Popery, or dispens'd with all the Laws against Popery and Papists? No; on the other hand, it is well known that the Laws were still in Force, and accordingly some time in the same Year, 1625, there was an Injunction from the Throne to put them severely in Execution. (See Letter II)

It is further admitted, that the King, some time in the same Year, promis'd the Parliament, That the Laws should be put in Force against Papists and Recusants; and as it is certain that they were put in Force against them; so it is granted, that after his Majesty made this Promise, he pardon'd some Popish Priests or Jesuits. But was he for this, chargeable with a Breach of his Promise? Did the King, by Virtue of the Promise, which he made the Parliament, divest himself of his Prerogative? Did he hereby put it out of his Power to pardon a Criminal for ever after? No, certainly. As fuch a Power was always deem'd an undoubted Privilege of the Crown, so no Promise which a King of England has been pleas'd to make his People, with regard to the Execution of the Laws, was ever suppos'd to deprive him of of that Power, or ever interpreted a Diminu-

tion of his Prerogative. I missioned has sensited

The King, it is granted, is the Fountain of Honour, and the Throne should be ever facred, and an Oracle of Truth; and yet several Emergencies may make it highly expedient, that a Prince should extend his Mercy to Criminals, who have incurr'd the feverest Penalties of the Law, I shall only trouble the Reader with an historical Passage, which, I presume, will not be thought altogether foreign to the Purpole. -The Earl of Briftol, in the Reign of K. James I. was charg'd with concealing and perfuading to fet at Liberty several Priests and Jesuits. The Earl in his Defence, in King Charles the First's Time, absolutely deny'd the Charge; but at the fame time plainly intimated, that if he had done, what he was charg'd with, he had done nothing more than what had been done by other Ambassadors, and which, for Reasons of State, had been always deem'd warrantable.

"It is true, fays he, that the Ambassage in Spain, " is far different from the Employment of other " Places, where there is a Body of our reform'd " Religion, and where his Majesty hath Kindred " and Allies; whereby his Majesty's Ministers " may be inform'd of the necessary Occurren-" ces of State, without the Helps of Priests or " Jesuits. But in Spain there being none but " Roman Catholicks, nor any Manner of Cor-

" respondency or Intelligence but by them, the " Ambassadors must make use of all Sorts of

" People, especially of Jesuits and Priests; and

"to that End Ambassadors sent thither have a large and particular Warrant under the King's Hand, to treat and make use of Priests and Jesuits, and all other Sorts of Men, unless it be such as are proclaim'd Rebels. And divers Times the Ministers employ'd in Spain, to gratify some whom THERE they employ'd in the King's Service, bave, as he believeth, at their particular Suit, mov'd his Majesty to extend Grace and Favour to some particular friend or Kinsman of theirs being a Roman Catholick and imprison'd in England; and that he remembereth to have happen'd to others, but doth not remember, to have writ-

" ten to his late Majesty in that kind." (Ra-

pin, Vol. II. p. 339.)

The next Quotation from Mr. Neal, in Proof of his Majesty's insidious and evasive Conduct, is remarkable, and will deferve particular Notice. This Writer does not directly charge the King with Breaches of his Word. He asperses him in a more artful Manner; he first takes it for granted, that he fign'd fome Articles of Marriage in favour of his Roman-Catholick Subjects, and then wonders, that he should make the Parliament Promifes fo utterly inconfistent with those Articles. " It is surprizing, fays he, " that the King should make fuch Pro-" mifes to his Parliament, within fix Months " after be bad fign'd bis Marriage Articles, " in which he had engag'd (plighting even his " Honour and Conscience) to set all Roman Ca-"tholicks at Liberty, and to suffer no Search " or " or Molestation to be given them for their Re-" ligion; and had in Consequence of it par-

" don'd'twenty Romish Priests, and given Orders to his Lord Keeper to direct the Judges

" and Justices of Peace all over England to for-

" bear all manner of Proceedings against his

" Roman Catholick Subjects," &c.

But if his Majesty never sign'd any Articles of this kind, then Mr. Neal's Surprize and Insinuation must be mere Farce and Calumny. Now it is almost certain, that the King never sign'd any Articles to the Purposes abovemention'd.

That, upon the Queen's Arrival in England, Profecutions against Papists were stop'd, and several Romish Priests pardon'd, is true; but that these Indulgences and Pardons were granted in Confequence of his Majesty's Marriage Articles, is, in all Probability, false. They were Matters of Compliment paid the French Court, which could not well be avoided. The great Civilities and Marks of Esteem with which the Queen was given to his Majesty in Marriage requir'd a Return; the King of France, in Honour to the new Alliance, having granted a general Indemnity to Debtors, and other Prisoners throughout his French Dominions. This, as far as can be collected from the best English and French Historians, appears to be the obvious and true Account of the Affair.

That his Majesty was oblig'd by any secret Article of Marriage to perform these Acts of Grace and Indulgence towards his Roman Catholick tholick Subjects does not appear; at least not from any Evidence, which deserves the least

Degree of Credit.

Rapin, indeed, tells us, That the Treaty of Marriage contain'd Thirty publick Articles, (Twenty-three, fays Rulbworth) with Three fecret ones, wherein much the same Advantages were stipulated for the Catholicks, as in those of Madrid. — But how does it appear that there were any fecret Articles agreed upon, or fworn to, in either Treaty? In the Treaty itself it is very certain, there is nothing stipulated in Favour of Papists, only that the intended Queen, and her Family, should have a Chapel, and the free Exercise of their Religion; not one Word in favour of any other Catholicks. And as to the pretended fecret Articles, there is good Reafon to believe, that they are all mere Fiction and Forgery. The religious Principles, the folemn and repeated Protestations of K. Fames and K. Charles against Popery, and their avow'd Zeal for the Reform'd Profession during their Lives, and at their Deaths, make it highly incredible, that they ever confented to any Articles, which tolerated Popery, or which were likely to be of the least Prejudice to the Protestant Cause. The Proofs to this Purpose are so numerous, that it would be tedious to repeat them. I shall only trouble the Reader with an historical Passage or

In allowing the Articles of the intended Spanish Match, says Rushworth, K. James thus express'd himself: "Seeing this Marriage is to be with a Lady of a different Religion from us. " it becometh us to be tender; as on the one

" Part to give them all the Satisfaction conve-

" nient; fo on the other, to admit nothing,

" that may blemish our Conscience, or detract

" from the Religion here establish'd."

worth, Vol. I. p. 4.)

When it was rumour'd, that he intended to fign an Article in Favour of his Roman Catholick Subjects, He address'd the Parliament in

1620-1, in the following Words:

" As touching the Rumour, which is spread, " that I should tolerate Religion in respect to " the Match, which hath been long in Treaty " with Spain for my Son, I profess, I will " do nothing therein, which shall not be " honourable, and for the good of Religion, " else am I not worthy to be your King; and " if any thing break off this Match, it shall be " the Cause of Religion." (Rushw. Tom. I. p. 21.)

In his Majesty's Speech to the Parliament, on the 19th of February, 1624, he is still more

full to the Purpose:

" It hath been talk'd, fays he, of my Re-" miffness in Maintenance of Religion, and " Suspicion of a Toleration; but as God shall " judge me, I never thought, nor meant, nor " ever in Word express'd, any thing that fa-" vour'd of it. It is true, that at Times, for "Reasons best known to myself, I did not so " fully put those Laws in Execution, but did " wink and connive at fome Things, which " might

" might have hinder'd more weighty Affairs;

but I never in all my Treaties agreed to any

" thing to the Overthrow and Disagreeing of those Laws, but had in all a chief Preserva-

" tion of that Truth which I have ever pro-

" fess'd." (Rushworth, Tom. I. p. 115.)

King James's Advice to the Prince upon his Death-bed, is likewise remarkable. His Words were, That he should love his intended Wife,

but not ber Religion.

The Proofs for K. Charles's Protestant Principles have been mention'd already, and need not be repeated. These sew Particulars consider'd; is it possible to conceive, that either of those Princes ever sign'd any Marriage Articles, by which they oblig'd themselves to tolerate Popery?

Rapin himself, speaking of the secret Arti-

cles, acknowledges,

That Nalson, and other Writers, look upon them as fictitious, groundless, and improbable; and

That Rushworth, who mentions them, has given us some additional ones, which are allow'd, on all hands, to be Articles of very doubtful Credit. And what has Rapin offer'd to obviate all this, and to support the Credit of these secret Articles? not a single Syllable that is material. His Proofs are these,

1. That Rushworth mentions them;

2. That they are alluded to in a Declaration which the Earl of Bristol procur'd from the Court of Spain, and produc'd upon his Tryal.

3. That

3. That in a Letter pretended to be writ by Archbishop Abbot, the King is supposed to have design'd at least a Toleration of Popery; and

4. That immediately after K. Charles's Marriage, Profecutions against Papists were stop'd,

and feveral Romish Priests pardon'd.

I shall only make a short Remark or two upon these Proofs, and leave the Reader to judge of the Whole.

1. Then as to Rushworth's Evidence, Rapin himself has, in Effect, admitted, that no great Stress can be laid upon it, he having, besides the secret Articles, given us some additional ones, which are allow'd, on all hands, to be of

very doubtful Credit. And

2. As to the Declaration, which the Earl of Bristol is said to have procur'd from the Court of Spain, and the Letter ascrib'd to Archbishop Abbot, they are both justly suspected to be Forgeries. The Papists and Puritans, it is well known, had their particular Views and Interests in publishing such infamous Libels upon his Majesty; and as several such were actually publish'd, which have since been prov'd to be forg'd, it is not unreasonable to suppose, that the Declaration and the Letter, just mention'd, were of the same Nature.

As to the *Declaration*, it appears to have been a manifest Forgery; the Account which is given of it by those, who first publish'd it, and by those, who have since impos'd it upon the World as genuine, being absolutely inconsistent and absurd. They tell us, that it was sign'd

Q 3

by LORD CONWAY, the D. of BUCKINGHAM, and other Privy-Counsellors, and yet at the same time do not scruple to say, that the DUKE was so much out of Favour with the King, that his Majesty had form'd a Design to ruin him. Now that in such a Situation, the King would have entrusted the Duke with a Secret of the greatest Importance, is a Supposition too absurd to admit of the least Credit, or to deserve any further Animadversion.

3. And with regard to the Letter ascrib'd to Archbishop Abbot, it has likewise evident Marks of Forgery. In the first Place, there is not so much as a Date affix'd to it. They indeed who look upon it as genuine, suppose it to have been writ about a Year before the King made the above Speech in 1624; and by this Circumstance the Forgery is clearly discover'd, the King in his Speech to the Parliament, Feb. 19, 1624, having solemnly declar'd, That as God should judge him, he never thought, nor meant, nor ever in Word express'd any thing, that favour'd of what the pretended Letter of the Archbishop charges him with.

In the Letter the Archbishop tells the King, that he had propounded a Toleration of Religion.— Now either the Archbishop must have had undoubted Proof of this Article, or not. Upon either Supposition, the Letter is beyond all reasonable Contradiction a Forgery. For had the Archbishop been able to prove it, can it be supposed, that the King would so solemnly have deny'd it before the whole Parliament?

and

and had the Archbishop not been able to prove it, no one, I believe, can think, that he would have ventur'd to write such a Letter to his Sovereign; that he would have ventur'd, without clear Proof, to charge his Majesty with such a barefac'd Attempt to invade and violate the Laws of the Realm.

4. The other Proof is still more ridiculous than either; it is alledg'd, that immediately upon the King's Marriage, Profecutions against Papists were stop'd, and several Romish Priests were pardon'd. But does it follow from hence, that these Pardons and Acts of Grace were in Consequence of his Majesty's Marriage Articles? No; on the other hand, it is almost a Demonstration, from what has been faid already, that neither K. James, or K. Charles, ever fign'd any fuch Articles at all. Let the Reader then judge how far the above Charge affects his Majesty's Veracity, or whether Mr. Neal had any great Reason to be so surpriz'd, that the King should make the Parliament fuch Promifes in favour of the Protestant Religion. It is surprizing, says this Writer, that the King should make these Promises to his Parliament, within fix Months after he had fign'd his Marriage Articles, in which he had engag'd to fet all Roman Catholicks at Liberty, &c. It is, I think, much more furprizing, that any one, who pretends to write History, should be capable of such an unfair and difingenuous Representation of Facts.

The very Promises, which the King made the Parliament, and which Mr. Neal is so sur-

Q4 priz'd

priz'd at, amount to little less than a Demonstration, that neither He or his Father ever fign'd or confented to any Article in Favour of Popery. At the Time, when his Majesty made the Parliament these Promises, he was at War with Spain; and some time afterwards he was oblig'd to break with France too. If therefore He had confented to any fecret Articles, they must now, it is plain, have been in the Hands of his declar'd Enemies; and can we conceive that they would have scrupled to divulge them? No; it can't be suppos'd, but they would have made the same Use and Advantage of them, as all Nations, in the like Case, are wont to do. They would, undoubtedly, have publish'd them to the World; they would have endeavour'd to expose his Majesty to the Jealousy and Refentment of his Subjects. When some of the Queen's Servants were difmiss'd the Kingdom, it is well known, the French were ready enough to complain of a Breach of the Marriage Articles; and had the King ever fign'd any fecret Articles, in favour of his Roman Catholick Subjects, we can't suppose that they would have been filent, when he made the Parliament fuch open and folemn Promises, that the Laws should be put in Force against them? And yet it is remarkable, that during the War with France, the French never pretended that his Majesty was guilty of a Breach of Treaty in this Respect, or that ever any fecret Articles were agreed to.

As this is well known to be the Case, it may possibly

possibly be ask'd, How these secret Articles should be inserted in Rushworth's Collections?

To this the Answer is plain and obvious. During fo long a Negotiation with Spain, there were, no doubt, a great many rough Draughts of Articles offer'd on both Sides, which were never executed or agreed to. As there were probably Copies of these Draughts amongst the Papers relating to the publick Affairs, fo they would naturally fall into the Hands of the Rebels. Rushworth, therefore, being their Clerk Affistant, and employ'd to collect what Instruments he could to the King's Prejudice, can we wonder if he took Care to transmit these pretended Articles to Posterity, and make them serviceable to a Cause, in which he was so deeply engag'd? Papers of any kind, of Authority or no Authority; Articles, executed or not executed, which had the least Tendency to asperse the King, it is reasonable to suppose, would be carefully preserv'd by a Writer, who had no other Method to acquit himself, or his Party, of the most horrid Rebellion, but by fixing upon his Majesty the Charge of Popish and arbitrary Proceedings.

The next Quotations to this Purpose from Rapin, Oldmixon, &c. are too contemptible to be taken Notice of. However, lest the Reader should imagine that there is any thing formidable in the Author of the Essay's Arguments, I shall trouble him with a Remark or two.

1. Then it is said, That the King, in a Message to the two Houses, April 8, 1642, call'd God to witness, that he would never consent upon what-

whatsoever Pretence to a Toleration of the Popish Profession, or Abolition of the Laws now in Force against Popish Recusants in Ireland; and yet in the Year 1644-5, Jan. 18, in a Letter to the Marquis of Ormond, He order'd the Marquis to promise the Irish Rebels, that if they would give him the Assistance they had promis'd, he would consent to the Repeal of the Penal Laws against them. And in a Letter to the Queen, March 5, 1644-5, he promis'd to take away all the Penal Laws against the Roman Catholicks in England, if he might have their

Affistance.

As to the Letter, which his Majesty is suppos'd to have writ the Queen, it is one of those, which we are told, was found in the King's Cabinet at the Battle of Nafeby, and which the Parliament order'd to be printed and publish'd. Whether it be an exact Copy of the Original, no one can pretend to fay, the original Letters having never been produc'd. I own, favs Rapin, it is not impossible, that these Papers may bave been curtail'd or forg'd by the Publishers. --- However, admitting for once, that this Letter was writ by the King, what does the Charge amount to? why, the King, some time in the Beginning of the Year 1642, affur'd his Protestant Subjects, that he had no Intentions of tolerating Popery, and that he would never consent to such a Thing upon any Pretence what seever. But when his Majesty made this Promise, had not these Protestant Subjects of his promis'd and fworn, that they would bear true

true and faithful Allegiance to him? Most certainly, they had; and yet before the King had offer'd any Terms to the Irish; before he wrote to the Marquis of Ormond or the Queen, these good Protestant Subjects of his had invited the Scots into England, and appear'd in open Rebellion against him. As this was the Situation of Affairs in England, his Majesty began to interpose his Authority in the Management of Affairs in Ireland, a little more than he had done before. When he faw the very Men and Money which were rais'd by his Authority for the Relief of Ireland, employ'd by the English Rebels against himself, he order'd the Marquis of Ormond to grant the Irish Rebels a Cessation of Arms, and to promise them, that if they would give him their Affistance in suppressing the Rebellion in England, he would consent to the Repeal of the penal Laws against them. As this is a true State of the Case, I shall only trouble the Reader with a short Story, and leave him to judge, whether his Majesty's Conduct in this Respect was so very culpable as the Author of the Essay would make us believe.

A certain Gentleman had three Sons, of very different Tempers and Dispositions. The Eldest, whom he intended to make his Heir, was remarkably dutiful, and generally took Care to pay him that Regard, which was due to a tender Father. The Second made Professions of Duty; and though he was a Lad of no great Virtue or Sincerity, yet his Father indulg'd him,

and frequently promis'd that he would give him a very handsome Fortune. The Third had been always a profligate young Fellow, and by a loose, debauch'd Behaviour had so far disoblig'd his Father, that it was once thought,

he would have left him little or nothing.

An Accident happen'd, which gave a different Turn to the Affairs of the Family, and oblig'd the old Gentleman to alter his Will and discard his Second Son entirely. This fanctify'd Hypocrite became so jealous and distrustful of his Father's Affection (for Infincerity is generally attended with Jealoufy) that he had laid a Scheme to murder him, to seize upon his Estate, and difinherit his Elder Brother. The Father, appriz'd of the Defign, acquainted his intended Heir with it, who being vastly shock'd at the Account, heartily join'd with his Father in endeavouring to prevent the Villain from carrying his impious Defign into Execution. The Third Son likewise hearing of the Affair, seem'd to be greatly troubled, and made the old Gentleman a tender of his Service. But the Father, confidering that he was of a very undutiful and cruel Disposition, was in a Doubt, for some Time, whether he should trust him. this, the young Fellow pretended, at least, that he was forry for his past Behaviour, and earnestly begg'd to be admitted into Favour. The Father, confidering the Distraction of his Family, and the Danger he was involv'd in, at last forgave him, and told him, if he would affift him at this critical Juncture, and be dutiful for the future. future, he would settle upon him the Fortune which he had promis'd his Second Son: And I never could learn, that the old Gentleman was ever blam'd for this Breach of Promise to his Second Son, by any of his Neighbours, but only by some who had imprudently engag'd to affist his Son in his horrid Design. The unprejudic'd Part of the Neighbourhood were of Opinion, that the undutiful and rebellious Behaviour of the Son, had cancell'd all Promises and Obligations whatsoever between him and his Father.

2. The next Author who is cited, is that Great Lover of Truth, the famous Mr. Oldmixon. The King, says he, just before he received the Sacrament at Oxford, in 1643, solemnly declar'd, that as he hop'd to receive Comfort by that blessed Sacrament, he intended the Establishment of the true reform'd Protessant Religion—without any Connivance at Popery. And yet, astonishing to read! the very next Day was Peace given to the bloody Irish Rebels, by the Cessation then agreed on at Oxford, in which Toleration was granted to the Catholicks of Ireland.

The Reader will easily perceive, that this Charge is much of the same Nature with the former, and therefore needs no Reply. However, as the Author of it has given himself an unusual Air of Assurance, I shall endeavour to set the Affair in a clear Light.—And yet, says he, astonishing to read! the very next Day was Peace given to the bloody Irish Rebels, by a Cestation

fation agreed on at Oxford. But why so very aftonishing? Did his Majesty grant the Cessation out of any Regard that he had to Popery or Papists? No; on the other hand, it is well known, that it was done at the earnest and repeated Requests of the Protestants themselves in Ireland; and that the King could not be persuaded to consent to it, till it was evident, that his Protestant Subjects in that Kingdom, could not otherwise be preserved. The Account which Sir Edward Hyde has given of this Affair, being clear and satisfactory, I shall beg Leave to transcribe it.

" That loud Clamour, fays he, against the " Cessation in Ireland, was so fully and clearly " answer'd by the King's Commissioners at the "Treaty at Uxbridge, that there can no Scruple " remain with any, who have taken the Pains " to read the Transactions in that Treaty. It " plainly appears, that the King could not be " induc'd to consent to that Ceffation, till it was " evident that his Protestant Subjects in that " Kingdom could not be any other Way pre-" ferv'd; the Lords Justices and Council of " that Kingdom, fignify'd to the Speaker of the " House of Commons, by their Letter of the 4th " of April (which was above fix Months before " the Ceffation) That his Majesty's Army and " good Subjects there, were in Danger to be de-" vour'd for want of needful Supplies out of " England, and that his Majesty's Forces were " of Necessity sent Abroad, to try what might be " done for fustaining them in the Country, to " keep

keep them alive till Supplies should get to " them, but that Defign failing them, those " their Hopes were converted into Astonishment, " to behold the Miseries of the Officers and Sol-" diers for want of all Things, and all those " Wants made insupportable in the Want of " Food, and divers Commanders and Officers de-" claring, they had little Hopes to be Supply'd " by the Parliament, pressed with so great Im-" portunity to be permitted to depart the King-" dom, as that it would be extreme difficult to " keep them there; and in another Part of that " Letter, they express'd; that they were expel-" ling thence all Strangers, and must instantly " fend away for England Thousands of poor des" poil'd English, whose very eating was then in insupportable to that Place, that their Con-" fusions would not admit the writing of many " more Letters, if any, (for they had written " divers others, expressing their great Necessities.) " And to the End his Majesty and the English " Nation, might not irrecoverably and una-" voidably suffer, they did desire, that then, " (tho' it were almost at the Point to be too late) " Supplies of Victuals and Ammunition in pre-" fent, might be haften'd thither to keep Life, " until the rest might follow, there being no Vic-" tuals in the Store, nor a bundred Barrels of " of Powder (a small Proportion to defend a " Kingdom) left in the Store, when the Out-" Garrisons were supply'd, and that Remainder, " according to the usual necessary Expence, be-" fides extraordinary Accidents, would not last " above

et above a Month: And in that Letter, they " fent a Paper fign'd by fundry Officers of the " Army, deliver'd to them as they were ready to " fign that Dispatch, and by them apprehended to " threaten imminent Danger; which mention'd, " That they were brought to that Exigent, that they were ready to rob and spoil one another, that their Wants began to make them def-" perate: That if the Lords Justices and Coun-" cil there, did not find a speedy Way for their " Preservation, they did desire that they might " bave Leave to go away; That if that were " not granted, they must have Recourse to the Law of Nature, which teacheth all Men to oreferve themselves.

"The two Houses, who had undertaken to carry on that War, and received all the Money raised for that Service, neglecting still to send Supplies thither; the Lords Justices, and Council, by their Letters about the Middle of May, " advertised the King, That they had no Vic-" tuals, Cloaths, or other Provisions, no Money " to provide them of any Thing they want; no " Arms, not above forty Barrels of Powder; es no Strength of serviceable Horse; no visible

" Means by Sea or Land, of being able to pre-" ferve that Kingdom. And by others of the 4th of July, That his Armies would be forced, through Wants, to disband or depart the " Kingdom, and that there would be nothing to " be expected there, but the instant Loss of the

" Kingdom, and the Destruction of the Rem-

" nant of his good Subjects, yet left there."

This

This was the Condition of that miserable Kingdom, to whose Affistance his Majesty was in no Degree (of himself) able to contribute; and his Recommendation and Interposition to the two Houses, whom he had trusted, was so much contemned, that when upon their Order to iffue out, at one Time, One Hundred Thousand Pounds of the Monies paid for Ireland, to the Supply of the Forces under the Earl of Effex (albeit it was enacted by the Law, upon which those Monies were raised, That no Part of it should be employed to any other Purpose than the reducing the Rebels of Ireland) his Majesty by a special Message, advis'd and requir'd them to retract that Order, and to dispose the Monies the right Way, the Necessities of Ireland being then passionately represented by those upon the Place, they return'd no other Satisfaction or Anfwer to his Majesty, but a Declaration, That those Directions given by his Majesty for the retracting of that Order, was a high Breach of Privilege of Parliament.

When his Majesty perceiv'd that no Assistance was, or was like to be apply'd to them, and that the Enemy still encreas'd in Strength and Power, he referr'd the Consideration and Provision for themselves, to those, whose Saseties and Livelihoods were most immediately concern'd, and who were the nearest Witnesses of the Distresses, and the best Judges, how they could be borne, or how they were like to be relieved; and so with the full Advice and Approbation of the Lords Justices and Council there,

R

and concurrent Opinion of all the chief Officers of the Army, that Cessation was made, by which only the Protestants in that Kingdom, and his Majesty's Interest there, could at that Time have been preserv'd *.

* The Author of the Inquiry into the Share which King Charles I. bad in the Transactions of the Earl of Glamorgan, &c. might therefore have fav'd himfelf the Trouble of the following artful and invidious Reflection: " If, after all, it should be " urg'd in Justification of the King's Conduct in this Point, that " in a State of War and Violence, he was entitled to all Means " for the Recovery of what he thought his Rights, it may justly "be answer'd, that a good Man will always scruple the Use of " fome Means, however just his Cause may be; that a good " Prince will never profecute his Royal Rights by fuch Methods, " as tend to the inevitable Ruin of his Country; and that a good " Protestant will abhor the Re-establishment of his Civil Author " rity by endangering the Safety of his own Religion throughout "his Dominions." Preface, Page viii. The Enquirer might have fav'd himself the Trouble of this Reflection, it being certain that the King had nothing more at Heart, than the Interest of the Reform'd Religion; that he often scrupled to extricate himself out of Difficulties by Means, which he thought would in the least reflect upon his Honour or Conscience; that the Concessions he made in the Irish Treaty, and in the Cessation, were purely the Refult of Necessity, and for the Preservation of his Protestant Subjects; that they must otherwise have been utterly ruin'd, as is clearly prov'd, with regard to the Cessation in the Life of the Duke of Ormond, Vol. I. p. 418, 19. 424, 5, 6, 8; and from p. 454 to p. 463; and particularly to the Conviction of the Parliamentarian Rebels in the English House of Commons, A.D. 1645, (two Years after it was made, when the State of Affairs and the Circumstances of Facts were much better known, than they can be at this Time) by the Memorial of Sir Philip Perciwal, Great Grandfather to the present Earl of Egmont. The Enquirer knew this very well, and yet is not ashamed to reprefent "the View of drawing over the Army under the M. of " Ormand's Command into England, for his Support against the " Parliament, to have been one of the King's principal Mo-"tives for concluding that Cessation." (Enquiry, p. 2.) If it had been so, there is no Reason to blame the King for employing his own Forces as well against English and Scotch Rebels, as against Irish, when the Service or Necessity of his Affairs, or the 3. The

3. The Author of the Essay goes on, and observes, "Alike hard is it to reconcile with Sincerity, his Majesty's Declaration from News ark, (March 9, 1641) in which he very seriously disown'd all Correspondence Abroad for engaging foreign Aids: We are consident, fays he, no sober honest Man in our Kingdom can believe, that we are so desperate, or so senseles, as to entertain such Designs as would bury our Name and Posterity in perpetual Scorn and Insamy. And yet, AT THE VERY SAME TIME, the Queen was solliciting for Succour from Lorrain, ten thousand Men, by the King's Privity and Direction," &c.

This Charge is fully answer'd by Sir Edward Hyde, in the Appendix to Lord Clarendon's History, page 135, 136, &c. to which therefore I shall refer the Reader. However, a Remark or two upon it may not be amiss. How then is this Charge prov'd? How is it prov'd that the

Safety of his Person and loyal Subjects requir'd it. — However it is observable, the Enquirer, to serve a different Turn, is pleas'd in another Place (Page 317.) to doubt whether this which he before maintain'd to be one of the principal Motives, was really any one of the Motives which his Majesty had for a Cessation.

But the Blunders and Inconfishencies of this Writer will be consider'd in another Place. As he desires to have clear Proofs of the forg'd Commissions of the Earl of Glamorgan, I hope to be able very soon to give him full Satisfaction with regard to that Point, and to shew, that his whole Libel upon K. Charles is built upon the most groundless Conjectures; upon Commissions, Patents, and Letters, which carry with them such evident Marks of Forgery, that sew Writers of the reputed Author's Abilities, would have publish'd them, in the Manner and with the View, which the Enquirer hath publish'd them.

R 2

Queen,

Queen, in 1641 (at the Time when the King made the above Declaration) was folliciting for Succour from Lorrain? why, by a Letter which the King wrote the Queen in the Year 1644, and which is just as good a Proof, that the Queen follicited for Forces from Abroad in 1641, as that she apply'd for them ten Years before. In this Letter, dated Feb. 19, 1644, the King bopes the Queen would baften all possible Assistance to bim, particularly that of the Duke of LORRAIN; and from hence the Author of the Essay would make his Readers believe, that the Queen sollicited for Succour from Lorrain near three Years before. Such arrant Sophistry is this Author forc'd to make use of, in order to impeach his Majesty's Veracity, and fix upon him the Charge of Infincerity.

The Truth of the Affair (supposing the Letter to the Queen to be genuine, which by the by is justly question'd) was this: Whilst the Parliament, in 1641, made Professions of Duty and Loyalty to the King, and pretended that they were inform'd from Rome, Venice, Paris, and other Parts, that he had follicited for foreign Aids, to maintain his Royalty against the Parliament, his Majesty affur'd them that he had no fuch Defigns, and that their Apprehensions were groundless; and because his Majesty, about three Years afterwards, when they appear'd in open Rebellion against him, desir'd the Queen, in a Letter, to hasten all possible Assistance to him, he is charg'd with Infincerity. - But if the King had had made his People a Promise, when they were good Subjects, does it follow, that he was oblig'd to keep it, when they became Rebels? The Reader is only desir'd to recollect the Story just mention'd of the undutiful Second Son, and left to judge of this Charge as he thinks proper.

4. The next Charge against his Majesty is such a Specimen of the Essay Writer's Modesty, Candour, and Ingenuity, as perhaps is not to be equall'd in the Writings of any Author, even

the celebrated Mr. Oldmixon himfelf.

He observes. " That the Conduct of the King, as to the Condemnation of the Earl of " Strafford, seem'd also not a little to reflect " on his Veracity and Honour. He had, fays " Lord Clarendon, been present at the Earl's " Tryal, and heard all the Testimony given " against him, and had heard nothing prov'd, " by which he could believe, that he was a "Traitor, either in Fact, or in Intention; and " that therefore he declar'd it to be much against " his Conscience, and that he neither could nor " would give his Royal Affent to the Bill of " Attainder against him; - that he further pro-" mis'd the Earl, that they (his Enemies) " should not touch an Hair of his Head; -" that, notwithstanding all this, he pass'd the " Bill, for which he was greatly blam'd. Great " Cenfures (fays he) were past upon the King's " figning this Bill, as a giving up his most " faithful Servant."

Now would not any one conclude from hence, that the King, in this Writer's Opinion, was R 3 greatly

greatly to blame in passing the Bill, and giving up his most faithful Servant? Would any one conceive, that a Writer who thus arraigns the Conduct of his Majesty, could be an Advocate for those very Men, who brought the Earl to the Block, and made use of the most villainous Stratagems to induce his Majesty to pass the Bill, to do the very Act, for which he is here cen-

fur'd? But this by the by.

If the Earl was guilty of the Crimes which were laid to his Charge, if he was a Traytor to his Country, why must the King be censur'd for consenting to his Death? Now either the Earl was guilty of High-Treason, or his Prosecutors condemn'd him unjustly; but as the Effay Writer will scarce allow, that his Prosecutors were fuch a Set of Villains as to condemn a guiltless Person, it clearly follows, upon his own Way of Thinking, that the King, in delivering up the Earl to Justice, did nothing, but what his Duty strictly oblig'd him to do. Upon Supposition the Earl was a Traytor, his Majesty's Duty to his Country oblig'd him to pass the Bill; and any previous Promise which he had made the Earl, whilst he believ'd him to be guiltless, became absolutely null and void.

But if the Earl was not guilty of the Crimes, with which he was charg'd, (and it is notorious he was not) Why did his Prosecutors make use of such unjust Methods to get him sound guilty? Why did they take such infamous Pains to misguide the Conscience of the King, and in-

duce him to pass the Bill?

Had

Had the King treated his faithful Servant in such a barbarous Manner, as his Prosecutors treated him; had he willingly or treacherously given him up to the Rage of his blood-thirsty Enemies, there had been some Grounds for this Writer's little, mean Infinuations. But did his Majesty do any thing like it? Did he endeavour, or even desire, that the Earl should suffer? No; on the other hand, it is well known, that he pass'd the Bill with the utmost Reluctance; nor was there, perhaps, any Act in his whole Life, for which he shew'd such sincere Marks of Sorrow and Concern *.

Let the Reader then judge, whether a Writer must not have a more than ordinary Degree of Assurance, to blame his Majesty for an Act, to which he was utterly averse, and to which he had probably never consented, had not the very Party, whose Cause this Writer espouses, impos'd upon the King by one of the most arrant Forgeries that cruel and bloody Men could be capable of.

Some Readers may, perhaps, be unacquainted with this last Particular; for which Reason, it may not be amiss to give them a short Account of it. Several tumultuous and illegal Methods, made use of to induce the House of Lords to pass the Bill abovemention'd, are related by Lord Clarendon, and need not be repeated in this Place. I shall only observe, that, as the King was present at the Tryal of the Earl, and had heard every thing which was alledg'd against

^{*} Eikon Bafilike, Chap. II.

him; but nothing which prov'd him to be guilty of Treason, either in Fact or Intention, he declar'd, that it was much against his Conscience to give his Royal Assent to the Bill of Attainder, and that he neither could or would do it. The Party who had impeach'd the Earl, and were resolutely bent upon his Destruction, hearing that the King was resolv'd not to pass the Bill, had Recourse to an Expedient, which prevailed upon the King to alter his Resolution, and enabled them effectually to execute their unjust

and bloody Defign.

It was pretended, that the Earl defign'd to make his Escape out of the Tower. The Commons, upon this, defir'd that the Guards might be strengthen'd, and the Earl made close Prifoner. Accordingly, Captain Billing fly, the then Lieutenant of the Tower, upon an Intimation given to the House, that he was a great Confident of the Earl's, was remov'd, and Sir William Balfour, a Creature of the Party, put into his Place. Having now got the Earl absolutely in their Power, a Letter was drawn up. which, they pretended, was writ by the Earl, and deliver'd to the King. " The Earl, in this Letter, Lord Clarendon tells us, was very pa-" thetical, and full of Acknowledgment of his " Majesty's Favours; but represented in a live-14 ly Manner, the Dangers which threaten'd shimfelf and his Posterity, by the King's perfevering in those Favours; and, therefore, " by many Arguments, conjur'd him no longer " to defer his Assent to the Bill, that so his 66 Death : coini

Death might free the Kingdom from the many Troubles it apprehended."

" The Delivery of this Letter being quickly

known new Arguments were applied; — that this free Confent of his own, clearly absolv'd the

" King from any Scruple that could remain with

" him; and so, in the End, they extorted from

" him to fign a Commission to some Lords to

" pass the Bill," has senored door to gain

That this Letter was a Forgery of the Party, is, I think, now prov'd beyond all Dispute. As the Account, which a learned Historian * has given us of this Affair, is curious, and may not be disagreeable to the Reader, I shall give it him in his own Words:

" That fuch a Letter was given to the King, is not to be doubted. Lord Clarendon exor prefly affirms it, and all the Historians of " the Time agree in that Fact; they suppose it to be really wrote by the Earl of Strafford, " and, upon that Credit, it hath been taken for granted ever fince. But whether the Earl actu-" ally wrote it, may justly be question'd; not only because the Action itself is so very extraordi-" nary, that it looks romantick; and he was too wife a Man, not to foresee the fatal Ef-" fects, which his being given up to popular " Rage and Clamour, would have upon the King's Counsels and Affairs, but also because " it cannot be reconcil'd with that Astonish-" ment, which feiz'd him, upon Secretary

" Carlton's acquainting him, that the King had

^{*} Carte's Life of James the first Duke of Ormond, Vol. II. pass'd

" pass'd the Bill, nor with that Exclamation which came from him on that Occasion, Put

" not your Truft in Princes, &c.

" It is well known, that the Hand-Writing " of Persons may be so exactly counterfeited, " and hath been, in Fact, so well imitated, " that no body hath been able to distin-" guish the counterfeit from the genuine Wri-" ting of fuch Persons; and that the Persons " themselves could not, with any Assurance, " pronounce it not to be their Hand, but only from the Matter and Substance of the Con-" tents, fo contrary to their real Sentiments, that " they knew certainly, they could never fet

" their Hands to fuch a Writing.

" It appear'd, on many other Occasions, that " the Party which persecuted the Earl of " Strafford with fo much Violence, never fluck st any Arts or Methods, however wicked or " dishonourable, which would serve their Ends; " and that fictitious Letters were one of the most " common and fuccessful Engines of their Po-" licy; and therefore there is no Reason to " imagine, that in a Matter of fuch Confequence " to their Affairs, which had been the Work of " fo many Months; and on which they were fo " furiously set (as they were on the Earl's " Death) that when they had it so near in their " View, and had brought their Scheme to the " very Point of Execution, they should in that " very Moment, when their Thirst of his " Blood was keenest, be troubled with any un-" reasonable Scruples, about forging a Letter in " his

" his Name, or imposing on the King, and " mifguiding his Conscience, in order to gain " their Ends."

It is certain, they had it in their Power to cause a Letter to be deliver'd to the King, in fuch a manner, that he could not possibly suspect its not being fent by the Earl, (who was absofolutely and folely in the Power of his Enemies) and to prevent any present Discovery of the Imposture. For they had a few Days before (on the 28th of April) fent a Message to the Lords. expressing their Fears of the Earl of Strafford's defigning an Escape, and defiring, that he might be made a close Prisoner, and the Guards strengthen'd. They had, on the very Day of the Date of this pretended Letter, upon a Petition of their Creatures, the Rabble; and a ridiculous Story of three good Wives of Wapping, peeping through the Key-hole of the Door of the Earl's Chamber, out of Curiofity to fee him, and overhearing him discourse with the Secretary, Mr. Slingsby, about his Escape, mov'd to have Captain Billing sley, (who was represented as a Great Confident of the Earl's) remov'd, with his Company, from the Guard of the Ammunition of the Tower, which Fort was by that Means entirely at their Devotion. For the Lieutenant, Sir William Balfour, a Scot, who was a Confident of that Party, had in this Affair of Captain Billing fley's, vilely traduc'd the King, as if he were of Confederacy for the Earl's Escape, and was ready to affirm and act wany.

any thing, which the Party should suggest and

direct as proper for this Purpose.

And Lord Clarendon mentions a Great Person then in Command in the Tower, who undertook, that if the King refus'd to pass the Bill of Attainder against the Earl of Strafford, he would, to free the Kingdom from the Hazard it feem'd to be in, cause his Head to be stricken off in the Tower. And when the Earl was in the Custody of Persons ready, out of Hatred to him, to run fuch Lengths as these; when Sir William Balfour refus'd to admit any Body to the Sight of the Earl, it is evident, that nothing was more easy, than to carry on such an Imposture, as this Letter was, without any the least Danger of Discovery; though, in Truth, if by Accident any had been made, the Party, by whose Direction it was carried on, had Power enough to protect and indemnify their Agents.

That it was an Imposture cannot reasonably be disputed, after considering the following Relation: The late Mr. Sidney Wortley Mountague, second Son' to the first Earl of Sandwicke, us'd to tell his Friends, that he had been assur'd by William late Earl of Strafford, Son of that Great Man, that when he was admitted to visit his Father, the Night before his Execution, upon Occasion of the latter's advising him to a private Life, to have nothing to do with Courts; and alledging his own melancholy Case, of being given up a Sacrifice to Party Rage and Malice, after all his Merits and Services to the Crown, as an Instance, how little Dependence

was to be had upon them, he could not help expressing his Wonder at those Complaints of being given up, when it was done at his Father's own Request; and then mention'd the Affair of the Letter, and the Consequences thereof. His Father receiv'd the Account with all the Surprize imaginable, and declar'd to him, very solemnly, That he had never wrote any such Letter; and that it was a mere Forgery of his Enemies, in order to misguide the King to consent to his Death.

This Son of the Great, but Unfortunate Earl, and Mr. Montague, were bred up, began the World, and set out upon their Travels together; and from him, soon after the Catastrophe of his Father's Death, Mr. Montague had this Account, which he was very free in averring, on various Occasions, to his Friends, particularly to a Set of them, with whom he us'd to associate at Mr. Killegrew's Lodgings in Somerset-House, among which were the late Earls of Sunderland, and Oxford, Mr. Doddington and Mr. Howard, now Keepers of the Paper-Office, from which last I received this Relation, and who is still living, and ready to attest it.

As this Account is clear and satisfactory, it would be needless to trouble the Reader with any tedious Remarks upon it. It is well known that most Writers, who have taken Notice of the Case of the unfortunate Earl of Strafford, agree, that when the King had pass'd the Bill, the Earl receiv'd the Account with great Surprize.

prize, and broke out into the following Exclamation, Put not your Trust in Princes, nor in the Sons of Men; for in them there is no Salvation. — But, if the Earl writ the above Letter to the King, and desir'd him to pass the Bill, how can these Particulars be reconcil'd? How can the Surprize, or the Exclamation of the Earl, be possibly accounted for? On the other hand, upon Supposition the Letter was a Forgery of his Enemies, all is plain and easy; in this Case, the Surprize of the Earl was natural, and every Circumstance of the Story appears to be consistent.

These Things consider'd, what must we think of a Writer, who, in order to asperse his Majesty's Honour and Veracity, has the Assurance to charge him with an Act, which those very Men, for whom this Writer is an Advocate, forc'd him upon, and to which the King had an utter Aversion, till, by Methods the most wicked and infamous, they had misguided his Conscience, and betray'd him into a Compli-

ance.

An Author, who liv'd in those Times, has a Remark upon the Behaviour of the Earl's Enemies, with regard to the Affair we are speaking of, which perhaps may not be thought impertinent. He observes that, in this Particular, they resembled the Devils themselves. None, says he, did make more Use of this (i. e. of his Majesty's consenting to the Earl's Death) to pollute his Honour, than those who had even forc'd him to it; like those malignant and cursed Spirits.

rits, who upbraid unhappy Souls with the Crimes and Ruins to which they themselves have tempt-

ed and betray'd them.

The Justness of this Author's Observation may eafily be prov'd, and will hold good in many other Instances, in which the Esfay-Writer and his Party have censur'd the King's Conduct. But, at present, I have neither Leisure or Inclination to pursue the Subject. It was certainly base and abominable Behaviour in Subjects, to charge their Sovereign Prince with Crimes which they themselves were the Authors of; nor has the Effay-Writer any Reason to complain, that the Malice and Ill-nature of his Party, in this Respect, is compar'd to that of the Devils themselves. For till he acquits them of being instrumental in misguiding his Majesty's Conscience, and forcing him to consent to the Earl's Death, I fancy he will have some Difficulty to prove, that any great Injustice is done either him or his Friends, by a Comparison feemingly fo fevere. Upon the whole, what Share of Guilt is chargeable upon the Royal Martyr, in this Affair, and what upon the Party, who compell'd him to do the very Act, for which they censure him, the Reader is left to judge.

5. The following Remarks of this Essay-Writer are very extraordinary, and well deserve

particular Notice.

He would infinuate, that the King broke his Word with Oliver Cromwell; (Teneatis Amici?) and accordingly he tells us, That the Artifice

and Dissimulation, with which the King's Conduct too generally abounded, was what principally hasten'd his Catastrophe at last. Whilst the Parliament, says he, were negotiating the Terms of his Restoration (when a Prisoner at Hampton Court) He made a secret Agreement with Cromwell, by which, if the King clos'd with the Propositions of the Army, Cromwell was to be advanc'd to a Degree higher than any other; to be Vicar-General of England, as Cromwell was under Henry VIII.

While the Affair was transacting, the King wrote to the Queen, That the he affented to the Army's Proposals, yet if thereby he could procure Peace, it would be easier then to take off Cromwell, than now he was the Head that go-

vern'd the Armyandian ai danaamurliai galad to

of the King, intercepts these Letters, and re-

folv'd never to trust the King again.

A Person who thus charges a Sovereign Prince with Artifice and Dissimulation, should, at least, take Care to stand clear of such mean and ungenerous Practices himself; and yet, perhaps, there is not an Author extant, where so much Artifice and base Misrepresentation are to be met with, in so sew Paragraphs, as those abovementioned.

was a Prisoner at Hampton-Court, the Parliament were negotiating the Terms of his Restoration.

work to the tells us That the

Now would not any one conclude from hence, that the Parliament were very loval. and really intended to re-establish the King upon his Throne? And yet, if there is any Truth in History, the very Reverse of this is true. The Historians, who are professed Advocates for the Parliament, acknowledge, that in all their Treaties with the King, they do not appear to have had any Intention of coming to an Accommodation; but that the Proposals, which they generally made his Majesty, were fuch, as they knew, he could not in Honour or Conscience comply with. Coke, Rapin, and other Writers, who are far from representing the King's Actions in the most advantageous Light, are full to this Purpose. But this by the by.

2. This Author goes on, and politively afferts, that the King made a fecret Agreement with Cromwell, and quotes Coke's Detection of the Court of England for the Affertion. — But is there any such Affertion to be found in Coke? or had this Essay Writer any real Foundation for such a positive Affertion? I will give the Reader the Words of Mr. Coke, and leave him to judge of the Ingenuity of his Transcriber.

"There was a Report, fays he, at that Time, and so yet continues, tho' I cannot find the Bottom of it, yet I am consident, in Time,

" it will appear, that Cromwell made a private Article with the King, that if the King clos'd

" with the Propositions of the Army, Cromwell

s . "thould

" should be advanc'd to a Degree higher than any other, as Vicar-General of England, as "Cromwell was in the Reign of Henry the

cc VIIIth * "

Here we find the Essay-Writer swelling what Mr. Coke calls a bare Report, into a real Fact, and roundly afferting it to be such. Coke, indeed, says, I am consident in Time it will appear.—
The good Bishop of Worcester, speaking of his learned Predictions, said much the same thing; but the Prophet was so unfortunate as to outlive the Time fix'd for the Completion of them. As a Century has now past, since this secret Agreement between the King and Cromwell is suppos'd to have been made; and as the Story does not yet appear to be any thing more than a mere Report, or a Party Conjecture, what must we think of the Considence of Mr. Coke, or the Veracity of his Transcriber?

But the Degree of Credit due to this Story, will be best illustrated by a Case, which is plain

and eafy.

There was a Report a few Years ago, and so yet continues, tho' I cannot find the Bottom of it; yet I am confident, in Time, it will appear, "That a certain Tradesman, who lived somewhere in the West of England, and who was employ'd by the Government to carry Provisions to Gibraltar, was guilty of running "Wool, and actually caught in the Fact. The

^{*} See Coke's Detection, p. 17. See the Supplement, printed in 1696.

only Difference between the Report related by Mr. Coke, and the Report concerning the " bonest Merchant, is, that the former is still a mere Report, and the latter is known to be a " real Fact; the very Gentleman, who was the " Merchant's Friend, in preventing a strict En-" quiry into the Affair, having publickly de-" clar'd, that the Merchant was a little defective " in his Duty, and did not strictly observe the " Laws in that Respect. However, the Mer-" chant infifted upon it, that the Report was " groundless, and that it was a great Injury "done his Character; and accordingly he pub-" lish'd an Advertisement, wherein he promis'd " a Reward of Fifty Pounds (if I mistake not) " to any one who should discover the Author of " this infamous Report."

Now if a Report, which appears to be grounded upon a real Fact, is so infamous and injurious, what must we think of a Writer who has transcribed a mere Report from an Author. magnify'd it into a real Fact, and related it as fuch? A Report, which for any thing that has appear'd to the contrary, during the Intervention of a hundred Years, still continues to be a mere Report; not to fay an infamous, groundless Party Calumny? And yet, if this Report cannot be prov'd to be founded upon a real Fact, the Charge of Distinulation, which is here urg'd against his Majesty, must drop of Course: But, to proceed. Inflorenty and base Developed

133

3. During this Transaction, we are told, that the King wrote a Letter to the Queen, wherein are these Words: — Tho' he assented to the Army's Proposals, yet if, by assenting to them, he could procure Peace, it would be easier then to take off Cromwell, than now he was the Head that govern'd the Army.

We are told further, that Cromwell intercepted this Letter, and refolv'd never to trust the

King again.

main Class

What Authority Mr. Coke had for this Piece of History, I know not; he mentions no written Authority at all, and seems to rest the whole upon the Strength of a bare Hear-say, or Report. And what still lessens the Credit of these Particulars, Mr. Coke did not publish his Memoirs till 1696, above fifty Years after the secret Agreement between the King and Cromwell is pretended to have been made, and after the Letter to the Queen is supposed to have been writ.

But admitting, for once, that the King wrote this Letter to the Queen; that Cromwell intercepted it; nay, that the King made the above Agreement with Cromwell, does it follow from hence, that he was oblig'd to observe the Agreement? or that by writing to the Queen, in that Manner, he was guilty of Artifice, of Dissimulation, and Breach of Promise?

Might not the King be apprized of Cromwell's Infincerity and base Designs? — Might not he be affur'd, that Cromwell had no real Intention

to serve him, and that all his pretended Regard for his Majesty, was mere Hypocrify and Farce *? The King, it is most certain, was apprized of all this.

Major Huntingdon, who was plac'd as a Spy upon him, at Hampton-Court, plainly told him, That Cromwell was a Villain, and would defroy him, if he was not prevented; and in a short Time after, the Major threw up his Commission, and left the Army.

" Major Huntingdon, says Rapin, who had been employ'd by Cromwell, to amuse the

" King with several private Messages, finding,

" at length, that he had been the Instrument to deceive that unfortunate Prince, warn'd him,

" that Cromwell was not fincere, and would de-" ftroy him, if he was not prevented." (Ra-

pin, p. 539. Folio Edit.)

These Particulars consider'd, admitting that the King wrote the above Letter to the Queen, and that he had made a secret Agreement with Cromwell, no one, I believe, can think, that he was oblig'd to be very exact in observing it.

him of Cromwell's private boassing of his fine Arts in imposing upon the King. — It is certain, that some of the General Officers were fincere to the King, and really his Converts; and Barron, in his Desence, tells us, that one of them seeing Cromwell hold the King's Hand between his own, and while he made his Promises, washing it with his Tears; when he came out, he ask'd the Officer, Whether he had not asted his Part well? Who answer'd, Were you not in earness? Not in the least, reply'd he; for which he ever after detested him; and acquainted the King, what a Devil Incarnate he had to deal withal." (Echard, Page 638. Book II.)

Upon

[262]

Upon the whole, the Reader is left to judge what Degree of Credit is due to a Writer, who, in order to prove that King Charles was guilty of Dissimulation and Breaches of solemn Promifes, has been forc'd not only to have Recourse to the most idle Tales, and arrant Falshoods, but to dress them up in the basest Disguise and Missepresentation.

* Life Hanging of fings Roses, who had been employed by transacely to conside the second seco

mission, and left the Army.

our party and the Edition

" fleet land, if he was upe prevented."

Their Particulars opinion is admitting than the Keeg wood the disce Letter to the Letter and that he had spale of recent Agreement with

Forter arrival deamer both the Arthurst of the State of

was skilled at to be pair conflageous and the

The IRISH MASSACRE in 1641

CONSIDERED:

And the Question, Whether King CHARLES I. ever authorized, was privy to, or any ways concerned in, that horrid Scene of Barbarity, fairly Stated and Discussed.

HE hard Fate of the Royal Martyr, with regard to the Irish Massacre, is scarce to be parallelled in History. Friends and Foes (as was observed in a former Letter) Churchmen, Presbyterians, and Independents, Men who were Cotemporaries with his Majesty and knew him personally, have affured us, that he was a Prince of strict Virtue and Piety, and other the most humane and amiable Endowments.

The same unfortunate Prince by others is charged with a Behaviour as different from the above Character, as Darkness from Light, as the most shocking Vice from the most exalted Virtue. He is said to have been a wicked, lawless, hypocritical Tyrant; he is said to have had nothing in his Head or his Heart, but arbitrary Power and Oppression; nothing but an Intention to subvert the Constitution, and enslave his People. Nay, it is strongly infinuated, that he had a Hand in the IRISH MASSACRE; at least that he secretly countenanced and encounaged

raged the Men, who were the principal Actors in that horrid Scene of Blood and Barbarity. However, it is observable, that this Charge is brought against his Majesty only by two Sorts

of People; either by

Those, who were deeply concerned in dethroning and murdering him; who consequently had no other Method of vindicating their rebellious Behaviour, than by endeavouring to asperse his Character, and represent his Reign, as a continued Scene of Cruelty and

Oppression; or else by

Those, who were born long fince the horrid Scene was transacted—who consequently could know nothing of the Affair—nothing of the King's Behaviour, but what has been transmitted to them by their Ancestors; what at least has come to their Knowledge by some subsequent Discoveries. These Circumstances, duly attended to, may throw some Light upon the Point in Question.

1st, Then let us enquire, what was said of this Affair by the Rebels in King CHARLES'S Time; — what was suggested or insinuated by those, who were concerned in dethroning and murdering him. And here it appears, from

the most undeniable Evidence,

That great Pains were taken to make his Majesty's Subjects believe, that the Papists who acted this detestable Scene, acted by his Commission;

That accordingly, the strictest Enquiries were made into the King's Conduct in this Respect;

That

That Sir Phelim Oneal (who was at the Head of the Rebellion, and who pretended, till he was taken and imprisoned, that he had a Commission from the King for what he did) was in a particular Manner examined with Respect to this Point by the Commissioners at Dublin;

That they endeavoured by every Artifice — by Threats and Promises, to extort a Confession from him, that he received his Commission

from the King;

That they offered not only him, but several other Prisoners, their Lives, their Liberty, and Estates, upon Condition, they would declare that the King gave them the Commission by

which they acted.

And what was the Result of all this Enquiry? all this Artifice? Why, the very Men, who had been engaged in the most horrid Rebellion against his Majesty, could not be induced to accuse him falsely, or lay any thing to his Charge, of which they knew him to be innocent. But Rebels in general, Commanders and Friars, all persisted, at the Expence of their Lives, to declare, that they were utterly ignorant of any Commission granted by the King.

Sir Phelim Oneal, upon his Examination and Trial declared, that the King was innocent—that his Majesty knew nothing of his pretended Commission; and when the Judges offered him his Lite and Liberty, upon Condition, he could bring any Proof, that the Rebels had received a Commission from the King, he still persisted,

that

that his Majesty was innocent, and declared. that he could not in Conscience accuse him; that the Commission, which he had formerly pretended to have received from the King, was drawn up by his (Sir Phelim's) own Orders, and that the Seal which was fixed to it, was taken from a Patent of the Lord Caulfield's, found in the Castle of Charlemont. This Particular was further confirmed by the Testimony of Mr. Harrison, who was the very Man that took the Seal from the Patent, and fixed it to the Commission. Sir Phelim, at his Execution, when the same Offers of Mercy were made him, upon the same base and barbarous Conditions, still perfitted to attest the King's Innocence, and fealed the Truth of his Testimony with his Blood.

Now is it possible, that better Evidence can be produced, or required, for the Consutation

of any Calumny whatfoever?

The King's most implacable Enemies— Enemies, to whose horrid Cruelty and Rebellion he owed the Ruin of his Affairs—Enemies, to whom he owed the Loss of his Crown and his Life, not only acquitted him of having any Hand in the barbarous Scene, which we are speaking of, but acknowledged and proved, that the Commission, which was said to be his Majesty's, was a Forgery of their own.

Here then is a Calumny without Foundation, and without the least Shadow of Proof. Now is it possible, that such a Calumny can ever gain Credit, with Men of Sense, in Prejudice to the

Character

Character of King Charles I.? If we can believe, that that Prince gave the least Countenance or Encouragement to the Irish Massacre, we must believe him to have been the most cruel, the most wicked, hypocritical Tyrant upon Earth; that is, we must, without Foundation, without the least Shadow of Proof, believe something which appears to be absolutely false; which appears to be utterly inconfiftent with the most authentic Records - with the Testimonies of the most unprejudiced Writers, that are extant: Writers of all Sects and Denominations, who were Cotemporaries with his Majesty, and who knew him personally, having affured us, that he was a Prince of strict Virtue and Piety - of the most bumane and amiable Qualifications. I think, I may venture to rest this Point upon the Evidence alledged and referred to * without a further Remark.

At the RESTORATION the Affair of the Marquis of Antrim was brought upon the Carpet, and examined with more than ordinary Exactness by the Council in Ireland, and the Privy Council in England. But this, and the former Particular in Regard to Sir Phelim Oneal, have been considered by an eminent Pen in so judicious a Manner, as to admit of no Reply J. I shall therefore only mention a Circumstance or two which may not be disagreeable to the Reader.

^{*} See all the above Particulars incontestably proved in Mr. Carte's Irish Massacre set in a clear Light.

† See Irish Massacre.

During the Rebellion in Ireland, the Council there seized upon the Marquis's Estates, and divided them amongst the old Soldiers and Adventurers. When King Charles II. returned to his Dominions, the Marquis applied for Redress. The King was so incensed at the Account which he had received of his Behaviour, that he refused to admit him into his Presence, ordered him to be confined, and a ftrict Enquiry to be made into the Affair. The chief Plea which the Council alledged for detaining his Estates, was not that he had been concerned in the Irish Massacre, but that his Estates were forseited by the Ast of Settlement, the Marquis having joined the Pope's Nuncio, and opposed the Peace in 1646 and 1648.

Another Circumstance necessary to be mentioned, is, that in the Year 1643 King Charles I. ordered the Duke of Ormand to treat with the Irish Rebels, and agree to a Cessation of Arms. The Marquis of Antrim had Instructions to the same Purpose; and he, with one Owen Oneal, a Protestant (they being then both in England) were dispatched into Ireland, to procure some Forces to be sent into Scotland, to the Affistance of the Marquis of Montrofe. The Marquis of Antrim, in Vindication of his Conduct in these Respects, produced the King's Letters and Instructions. King Charles II, after a strict Enquiry into the Affair acquitted the Marquis, and ordered his Estates to be restored. In the Letter which the King (Charles II.) wrote to the Duke of Ormond in favour

Photone 4

favour of the Marquis, were Words to the following Purpose — that upon Examination, they (the Council) found that he had the King (Charles I.) his Consent or Letter of Instructions

for what he did.

Sometime after the Revolution, a Pamphlet was published, intituled, Murder will out. Mr. Long, in his Review of Mr. Baxter's Life, calls it a scandalous Libel, and thinks it was wrote by Ludlow, when that infamous Regicide presumed to return into the Kingdom, in Hopes of Protection from the Government. But be this as it will, in this Pamphlet it is infinuated, that the above Paragraph in the King's Letter to the Duke of Ormond was a plain Intimation, that King Charles I. had given Lord Antrim a Commission for what he did. And if it be meant, that he gave him a Commission or Instructions for what he did in 1643 and 1644, it is readily granted.

Dr. Calamy, upon the Authority of this Letter, would infinuate a great deal more — he would infinuate, that this Letter implied that Lord Antrim had a Commission or Instructions from King Charles I. for taking up Arms in 164t, when the Rebellion began, and when the Papists were guilty of the horrid Massacre in Ireland. Bishop Burnet has infinuated the very same thing. And what are the Proofs to support this mighty Charge? Why, Dr. Calamy says, that when the King ordered Lord Antrim's Estates to be restored, "the Lord Massacrine, and there in Ireland, not fully

" fatisfied

" fatisfied with this, thought fit so far to pro" secute the Matter, as that the Marquis of

" Antrim was forced to produce, in the House of Commons, a Letter of King Charles I. by

" which he gave him an Order for taking up

" Arms, which being read in the House, pro-

" duced a long Silence."

In Reply to this Charge, it is proved, — as fully as a thing of this Nature can be proved,

That the whole is an absolute Falshood; that no Letter of this Sort appears to have been read, or even produced, before the Parliament;

That the Affair was only examined by the Council in Ireland, and the Privy Council in

England; and

That whatever Letters were produced by the Marquis before the said Councils, related to his Conduct in 1643, when he had Instructions from the King to procure some Forces to be sent into Scotland, to assist the Marquis of Montross. But of this more afterwards.

What does Bishop Burnet say with Respect to this Affair? Why, "that he had in his "Hands several of his (the Marquis's) Letters "writ in a very confident Style — that upon the Restoration in 1660, Lord Antrim was thought guilty of so much Bloodshed, that it was taken for granted, he could not be included in the Act of Indemnity, which was to pass in Ireland — that when a Report was prepared to be signed by the Committee, fetting forth, that he had fully justified him-

" felf in every thing, which had been objected

" to him, and that he ought not to be excepted out of the Indemnity. The Earl of North-

" umberland the Prefident of the Committee,

" refused to fign it, and said. He was forry

" Antrim had produced such Warrants; but that

" he did not think, they could serve his Turn;

" that he did not believe any Warrant from

" the King or Queen could justify so much

" Bloodshed, in so many black Instances, as

" were laid against him."

This is the Purport of what the Bishop obferves upon the Affair, in which he plainly intimates, that the Marquis was concerned in the Irish Massacre, and had the King's War-

rant for that Purpose.

And what is said in Answer to this great Charge? Why, it is proved, beyond all Possibility of a Reply, that the Marquis was not concerned in the Irish Massacre—and that he neither had, or pretended to have, any Commission or Instructions for acting in that horrid Affair. To this End, we are assured,

That the Court of Claims in Ireland, after the Restoration, on hearing his Cause, adjudged

him innocent:

That Sir Win. Churchill, one of the Commissioners of that Court (in his Divi Britannici, p. 347.) clears the King from giving any Orders, or being any ways concerned in that Rebellion;

That the Marquis is not so much as named in any one List of the Rebels concerned in the

Massacre;

That

That the Rebels complained of the Marquis

for not taking up Arms;

That at the End of the Year 1641, fome of them exclaimed against him, for not joining them;

That others declared, that their Cause fuf-

fered for his Non-concurrence;

That the Marquis himself condemned the Bloodshed and Robbery, which they had been

guilty of;

That the Rebels were so incensed against him, that when he was taken Prisoner, some were for detaining him, and others declared, that he deserved to lose his Head for saying (as he went through Armagh, at the latter End of April, or the Beginning of May 1642) that he saw nothing among them [the Rebels] but Defolation and execrable Cruelty, for which God's Wrath, and the King's just Revenge hung over their Heads, and would speedily overtake them. It appears further,

That the Marquis affisted the Protestants when they were besieged by the Irish Rebels;

That when the Rebels in March 1641 invested Colerain, he used all the good Offices he was capable of, to engage them to raise the Siege;

That he not only did this, but fent Provisions

and other Relief into the Town:

That in April 1642, there was a good Understanding between bim and the Duke of Ormond; at least, that he visited the Duke, was kindly received by him, and that the whole Army passing by, saluted him;

That

That in June 1642, he delivered his strong Castle of Dunluce into the Hands of Monroe. General of the Scotch Forces, and that when he left the Castle, he fled, not to the Irish Rebels, but into the Northern Parts of England. But this is not all. Ireton the Regicide (after the Marquis had had a Conference with Commissary General Reynolds and the Bishop of Clogber; and afterwards with that Bishop and Colonel Owen) was fo fully fatisfied that the Marquis had no Hand in the Irish Massacre, nor knew any thing of a Commission from the King, that he shewed him great Marks of Kindness. He gave him a Pass for going into England, and an Order to levy Money amongst his Tenants to discharge the Expences of his Journey. He gave him a Letter to the Council of State, recommending him to their Favour, and defiring, that he might have Liberty to compound for his Estates; and the rather, for that it did not appear, that he had any Hand in the Beginning of the Rebellion.

Now after all this, and numerous other Proofs, is it possible, that this Lord could have any Hand in the Irish Massacre, or any Commission for that Purpose? Yes; Dr. Calamy would infinuate, that he had; and the principal Proof, upon which he founds his Charge, is the above Paragraph in King Charles II's Letter to the Duke of Ormond, dated July 16, 1663; in which, it is said, that They (the Council) had found that He (the Marquis of Antrim) had the

the King's (King Charles I's) Confent or Letter

of Instructions for what he did.

In Reply to this Charge, it is proved from King Charles II's own Words, delivered on the very Subject of the Letter in the most authentic Manner, in an Act of Parliament (Anno 17 and 18 Car. II.) that the King's Instructions to the Marquis in the faid Letter, were no other, than what the Marquis received from the King and Queen in the Year 1642. The Words of the Act are these - His Majesty declares, that the Testimony of the Marquis of Antrim's Innocence, which he had given in that Letter of July 16, 1663, and which at the End of that Letter, the Duke of Ormand and Council are required to transmit to the Commissioners for executing the Act of Settlement, for them to regulate their Proceedings by, was only to declare, that the MARQUIS of ANTRIM was employed in Ireland to procure what Forces he could from thence to be transported into Scotland, for his late Majesty's Service, under the late Marquis of Montross, to the end, that the Conversation of the said Marquis of Antrim in the Rebels Quarters, which was necessary for that Service, might not, according to the Letter of the former AET; render bim criminal.

These are the Words of that Act of Parliament; and is it possible, for any thing more clearly to shew, what the Instructions of the King were? and what the Marquis of Antrim did in consequence of those Instructions? Does

not

not the Act expressly declare, with what Defign the Marquis corresponded with the Rebels? If therefore Mr. Baxter, Dr. Calamy, Oldmixon, &c. ever saw this Act of Parliament, nothing, surely, but the most obstinate Prejudice — the most perverse and determined Resolution to support the Calumnies and Falshoods of a Party, could have induced them to interpret to any other Sense, a Letter so clearly and fully ex-

plained.

And as to the other Letter, which Dr. Calamy fays, the Marquis was obliged to produce before the House of Commons, and in which King Charles is supposed to have given him an Order for taking up Arms, it is certain, that there never was any fuch Letter writ by the King in 1641, it having been clearly proved, that the Marquis had never any Commission - any Instructions to take up Arms during that Period - and that there is not a fingle. Authority extant for such a base Suggestion, but the infamous Libel, (Murder will out) which was writ fince the Revolution. Whether fuch an Authority will be thought sufficient to confront the Evidence of the most authentic Histories and Records, the impartial Reader will eafily determine.

Upon Supposition, therefore, that there ever was such a Letter, it is evident, that it must either have been one of those, which were examined in the Councils in England and Ireland, or else an arrant Forgery. If it was one of those, which were examined by the Councils

T 2

of the two Kingdoms, it has been clearly proved, that it was writ in 1643, and contained Instructions for the Marquis's Conduct at that Time, and could no ways relate to his Behaviour in 1641, which is the Point in Question.

I own, therefore, I am inclinable to think, (upon Supposition there ever was such a Letter) that it was one of the many base Forgeries of those Times, or else a Letter trumped up since the Revolution (perhaps by the Author of Murder will out) it having almost every Mark of the most arrant Forgery imaginable. For

I. Where is this Letter? Is it produced? No; it is no where to be found. It is not mentioned in any authentic Record, that is extant; and the Libellers do not pretend to fay, when it was writ. So that we are not at Liberty to examine it; we are not at Liberty fo much as to fee what Part of the Marquis's Conduct it was brought to justify, or whether it is fairly reprefented or not. These at least are suspicious Circumstances. But what is still more so,

2. It supposes the Cause of the Marquis to be brought before a Court, where the Cognizance of it did not properly lie; it being certain.

That the Cognizance of the Cause did not properly lie before the House of Commons;

That the Council was the proper Court to

hear it; and

That the English Parliament never meddled with the Settlement in Ireland. It is further certain,

That

That the fecond Act of Settlement, or the Act of Explanation, which restored the Marquis to his Estate, and which passed December 15, 1665, mentions a solemn hearing of the Affair before his Majesty at the Council-Board in England. It mentions likewise a Petition exhibited to the Council by several Adventurers and Soldiers — against the Marquis, and against the Judgment and Decree of the Court of Claims in his Favour, but gives not the least Hint, that any Petition was presented to, or any Letter produced before, the Parliament in England; which surely it would have done, if any such

had been presented. But

3. What is still more material, and which clearly proves the faid Letter to be either forged or misrepresented, it is quoted to justify a Man for doing, what (it is most certain) he never did. It is quoted to justify the Marquis of Antrim for being concerned in the Irish Massacre in 1641, and to prove that he had the King's Commission for that Purpose. On the other hand, it is clear, from the foregoing Observations, that he was no ways concerned in the Irish Massacre, and that neither he, nor any other Person, had ever received any such Commission or Instructions from the King. The Marquis himself was so far from pretending to a Commission, that though he lay at the Mercy of the English Rebels, and was very defirous to make his Peace with them, - though he knew, that he could not better recommend himself to them, than by accusing the King in this Point, T 3 yet

yet he utterly disavowed all Knowledge of any Commission whatever given to the Irish for

taking up Arms.

In his Conference with the Bishop of Clogher and Colonel Owen in 1650, he made no Scruple to give it under his Hand, that he knew nothing of a Commission from the King, and declared it in such a Manner, that even Ireton was satisfied, with regard to his Innocence in this Respect — became his Friend, and did him Service.

I shall only add one Testimony more, and leave the impartial Reader to judge of the whole Affair. The Testimony is Part of the Duke of Ormond's Answer to an Address of Thanks from the two Houses of Parliament in Ireland, when the Duke was going to leave the King-

dom in 1646-7.

And now, my Lords and Gentlemen, since this perhaps may be the last Time, that I shall have the Honour to speak to you from this Place; and since that next to the Words of a dying Man, those of one ready to banish himself from his Country for the Good of it, challenge Credit, give me Leave before God, and you here, to protest, that in all the Time I had the Honour to serve the King my Master, I never received any Command from him, but such as bespake him a wise, plous, protestant Prince, zealous of the Religion he professeth, the Welfare of his Subjects, and industrious to promote and settle Peace and Tranquillity in all his Kingdoms; and I shall beseech you to look no otherwise upon

me, than upon a ready Instrument set on Work by the King's Wisdom and Goodness, for your

Preservation, Andrews St. 188

Here we see a wise and worthy Personage - a brave, intrepid, virtuous, zealous Protestant - one endowed with every Qualification becoming his high Birth and Quality - one whose Integrity and Abilities had induced his Prince to repose in him a more than ordinary Confidence - to intrust him with the most important Affairs and Defigns - Here we fee this excellent Nobleman appealing to his God, and declaring upon a very folemn Occasion, and in a most solemn Manner, that during the whole Time in which he had the Honour to ferve the King his Master, he never could find, that he had the least Intention to infringe upon the Rights and Liberties of his Subjects civil or facred; but that he always found him declaring a most zealous Regard for the Protestant, established Religion, for the Good and Welfare of his People.

It may not be amiss to remind the Reader, that the Character, which is here given the King by this unprejudiced Nobleman, is no more than what is said of him by Friends and Foes—by those who were his Majesty's Cotemporaries, and who knew him personally. Friends and Foes, who had the Honour to know him, agree, that he was a Prince of every Virtue, which could adorn the Sovereign Character; and the most implacable Rebels were never able to fix upon him any thing material, in

which it appeared, that he had deviated from those equitable Maxims of Virtue and Justice, which were made the constant Rule of all his Actions*.

As to the Charge of his being concerned in the Irish Massacre, we have seen, that it was absolutely groundless — † that Irish Rebels, Papists, his Majesty's most inveterate Enemies, all acquitted him of that barbarous Imputation; and the English Rebels, who dethroned and murdered him; who had every Opportunity to examine into the Affair, that Victory, Success, or Power could give them — who actually did examine into it with the utmost Malice and Exactness, were never able to produce the least Proof, that he had any Share in, or ever gave any Countenance to, that horrid Scene of Barbarity. And

2. Is it not surprizing, that this infamous Charge should be revived a-fresh? Is it possible that the bare Surmises, the bare Hints and Insinuations of Men, who wrote since the Revolution, can be deemed Evidence sufficient to confront, what is here produced in his Majesty's Favour? are there any fresh Discoveries made? any new Proofs produced? Not one, but what has been or shall be fairly laid before the Reader, and fairly examined.

* See The Cafe of the Royal Martyr, Letter II.

⁺ See the foregoing Pages. As to what the Author of An Essay towards attaining a true Idea of King CHARLES, has faid upon this Particular, it will be considered in the following Chapter.

The principal Proofs, that ever were alledged in support of the above Calumny from the Restoration to this Day, are the following:

1. Some Instructions in a Letter or Letters writ by King Charles I. to the Marquis of

Antrim; and

2. An Expression of a vague and indeterminate Meaning, in a Letter of no Date, no

Credit, nor any where to be found.

As to King Charles's Letter of Instructions to the Marquis of Antrim, it had been suggested, that the Marquis was concerned in the Irish Massacre, and that the Instructions in his Majesty's Letter, were his Warrant for what he did. On the other hand it has been clearly proved,

That the Marquis was no ways concerned in

the Irish Massacre;

That the Instructions in the said Letter were examined by Men, who had every Opportunity of knowing their meaning — by King Charles II, who was far from being prejudiced in the Marquis's Favour — by the Privy Council in England, and by the Lords and Commons of Ireland assembled in Parliament;

That upon Examination, it was found that the Letter was written at least two Years after the Massacre in Ireland, and contained only Instructions for the Marquis's Conduct in 1643-4, as appears expressly from an Act of Parliament passed in the Year 1665.

As to the other Letter, they who mention it (viz. the Author of Murder will out, and Dr.

Calamy)

Calamy) do not pretend to say, When - by Whom, or to Whom, it was writ; they do not pretend to say, What were the Contents of it, or That it was ever read or seen by any Mortal

living.

Now is it possible, that such Proofs as these can have any Weight in the present Case? nay, is it possible, that Men of Sense can, with any Prospect of Success, offer Proofs in Prejudice to the Character of a Prince, which are utterly destitute of every circumstantial Incident that in Point of Evidence can give them the least Shadow of Credit? which are utterly inconsistent with all good History — with every authentic Record, that is extant?

- And yet, notwithstanding all this, the intelligent Reader need not be told, that the old detestable Calumny of his Majesty's being concerned in the *Irish Massacre*, has of late been revived with great Confidence, and that other things of a very extraordinary Nature, have been laid to the Charge of that unfortunate

Prince.

The intelligent Reader need not be told, that the Efforts of restless and designing Men to asperse the Character of the Royal Martyr, have of late been more numerous and virulent, than

for many Years last past.

He need not be told, that they now charge him with Crimes of such a horrid Nature, as must (if they can find People weak enough to believe them) transmit his Memory to suture Generations with the utmost Infamy. The Design Defign of these Men is obvious to every one,

who is capable of Reflection.

The Royal Martyr was a zealous Friend of the true, primitive, reformed Religion established in these his Dominions. He attended upon the public Service of the Church of England, with great Marks of Devotion all his Life-time, and at his Death declared himself a fincere Member of that Church, in which he had lived. He was, in one Word, a virtuous, pious, protestant Prince; and yet this virtuous, pious, protestant Prince was dethroned and murdered, not only by Men who were his Subjects, but who called themselves Protestants. In our public Records, indeed, they are called by other Names; in those they are transmitted to us under a very different Character. The Statute of the 12th of Charles II. fets forth, That they were as far from being true Protestants, as they were from being true Subjects that they were wretched Men, desperately wicked, and bardened in their Impiety.

This is too heavy a Charge to rest upon the Ancestors of those, who would sain be thought his Majesty's best Subjects; and this is the true Reason why they endeavour to asperse the Character of the Royal Martyr—to get the Observation of the Anniversary of his Martyrdom laid aside, and all Parliamentary Records, relating to it, obliterated. Their Ancestors must not be called Rebels and Regicides. This Imputation must be wiped off at all Events, and the Royal Martyr must be accused (as was

observed

observed by a noble Lord upon another Occafion) if not of all Popery, of balf Popery, very near Popery, almost all Popery, (wretched Sophistry!) and represented as a wicked, cruel,

lawless Tyrant.

However, as long as there is any History of King Charles I. - any authentic Records of this Kind remaining in the Kingdom, it is certain they can never acquit their Ancestors of the most horrid Rebellion, or ever expect to be credited in regard to those base Imputations, which they would fix upon the Royal Martyr. The Method which they take to justify the Conduct of their Ancestors, by afperfing the Character of the Royal Martyr, is in Effect declaring, that all good Men are Liars — that all History — all Accounts of that unfortunate Prince (except those, which are given us by Men, who were concerned in dethroning or murdering him) are absolute Falshoods. Their loading his Memory with the Charge of Impiety, Cruelty, and Tyranny, is in Effect fixing a Mark of Reproach, of Ignorance, or Hypocrify — of Prejudice and Partiality, not only upon every Historian of Credit, who have mentioned him, but upon every noble Lord and Gentleman, who were concerned in perpetuating his bleffed Memory to Posterity - who had any Hand in making an Act for annually declaring an Abhorrence of his Murder, and all rebellious Proceedings tending thereunto. These are Difficulties, not to fay Absurdities, which, I fancy, will require fome

fome Time for the most ingenious and artful Pens to reconcile and account for.

I shall only add a word or two which more immediately relate to the Point in Question. Upon Supposition the King authorized, or had any Hand in, the Irish Massacre, we are all as culpable in taking a folemn and religious Notice of the Death of fuch a cruel, wicked, lawless, hypocritical Tyrant, as that of a Nero, or a modern Bashaw. But as the Foundation, upon which this Charge is built, is, I prefume, clearly removed, the Superstructure must fall of Course. As it appears, that the King neither authorized, was privy to, or gave the least Countenence to that horrid Scene of Barbarity, the Guilt of loading his Memory with fuch an Imputation must lye at the Doors of the Authors of it. Let their Defign be what it will, the Guilt must be theirs. And what the great and complicated Guilt of fuch Men must be, who, at the Expence of Truth, who, in Defiance of all History of Credit, who, in Defiance of the most solemn Duties, which they owe to God and Man, have been so zealous and industrious to asperse the Character of a virtuous and pious Prince - to represent him as an abandoned, detestable Tyrant, - the impartial Reader will find no Difficulty to determine.

SOME REMARKS

Upon the XIVth Chapter of An Essay towards attaining a true Idea of King CHARLES I. concerning the Rebellion and Massacre in Ireland.

SEVERAL Objections made by the EssayWriter to the Conduct and Character of
King Charles I. have been obviated already,
and others will be considered in the following
Pages. At present some Animadversions upon
a sew remarkable Passages in the xivth Chapter
of this Author's Performance, may be sufficient.
They may at least serve to give us a Specimen
of his Ingenuity, and let us see, what Sort of
Methods he has taken to impose upon and

misguide illiterate Readers.

His very first Quotation in Prejudice to the King, (p. 109.) is introduced in the most artful and disguised Manner; nor does it contain the least Shadow of Proof of that for which it is alledged, but what arises from his own base and invidious Infinuations. It is alledged to prove that King Charles had at least some culpable Concern in the Irish Rebellion—that he secretly countenanced and encouraged it. Whether this, or any other historical Quotation in the whole Chapter, amounts to a Proof of so heinous a Charge, the Reader will soon be able to judge.

The two House's of Parliament, says the Essay-Writer (July 25, 1643) set forth a Declaration against the King concerning the Irish Rebellion, wherein they bring a great many strong presumptive, if not positive and irrefragable, Proofs, that the Insurrection of the Irish was encouraged, incited, and EVEN COMMANDED, FROM ENGLAND.

But what are these strong, presumptive, if not positive and irrefragable Proofs, and why are they not mentioned by the Essay-Writer? Why? because he knew they were no Proofs at all. He knew his own artful Suggestion, (that the Insurrection was encouraged, incited, and even commanded from England) was more likely to alarm and influence the unthinking Multiude, than what he calls strong Proofs. He knew, that his strong Proofs, were nothing but the impudent Lies and Calumnies of the Irish Rebels themselves; nay nothing but what some People, had heard them say.

The Irish Rebels called themselves the Queen's Army, and said, that they did nothing but by Authority from the King — that their Purpose was to come into England after they had done in Ireland. This, and some other things of the like Kind, we are told, were proved by one Owen O'Conelly and others — and especially in some Letters from Tristram Whitecombe, the Mayor of Kingsale, to his Brother Benjamin Whitecombe, wherein there is this Passage: — Many other strange Speeches they [the Rebels]

utter

utter about Religion, and our Court of England,

which I dare not commit to Paper.

Upon this the Parliament, in their Declaration, suggested, that the Rebellion in Ireland was framed and contrived in England (not commanded from England, as the Essay-Writer falsely afferts) that the English Papists should bave rifen about the same Time, and that it was

a common Speech among the Rebels.

Now what does all this amount to? Why, that the Rebels gave out or faid so - that it was a common Speech among st them. So that upon the whole, this Essay-Writer's strong Proofs are at length dwindled into just nothing at all - nothing but the impudent Lies of the Rebels themselves. Now what must we think of a Writer, who has not only charged the King with the most false and groundless Imputation, but endeavoured to fix it upon him by a Method shockingly base and barbarous! by imposing upon the World the impudent Lies, the treacherous Alarms of a Set of desparate Rebels - for strong, presumptive, if not positive and irrefragable Proofs? What must we think of a Writer who is capable of leaving upon the Minds of his Readers, an Impression of fuch an unjust and villainous Nature? But this is not all.

He could not be contented to fay, that the Insurrection of the Irish was encouraged and incited, but artfully adds - and even commanded from England. Now who could command the Irish to rise and appear in Arms, but

the King? fo that by adding the Words—
(and even commanded from England) he has hinted at the King, and left his Readers to conclude, that the King not only encouraged; but commanded, the Rebellion in Ireland; that the Rebels had the King's Authority, Commiffion, and even Command, for what they did. Nothing, surely, which drops from the Pen of such a Writer, can ever be read without the utmost Caution!

This Writer goes on in fo disguised and obscure a Manner, that it is difficult to make Sense of what he fays. However, I will endeavour to explain his Meaning. He observes: from Rapin, that though the King used his utmost Endeavours to clear himself from this Accufation (by which, I suppose, he means, what the Parliament accused him of in their Declaration (March 9, 1641-2) yet it was only by Generals and Protestations, without replying to any particular Article (and confequently without replying to the Article under Consideration) no not even in his Eikon Basilike, where he undertakes to vindicate his whole Conduct. - In another Place he observes from Mr. Neale, p. 122. It is a little (rather fays the Essay-Writer extremely) unaccountable, that his Majesty should never, by any public Act or Declaration of bis own, clear himself of so vile a Calumny.

It is observable, that Writers, who acknowledge that the Commission, which the Irish Rebels pretended to, was a Forgery, seldom omit to clog their Concession with this Difficulty.

U

The Defign of these Men is obvious. Though the Commission clearly appears to have been forged, yet we are not to conclude, that the King was wholly innocent; on the other hand, it is generally suggested by these Men, that he certainly gave fome fecret Countenance to the Infurrection — at least that he was not unacquainted with the Defign, before it took place, he having never, by any public Act or Declaration, cleared himself of so vile a Calumny; Though the King, fays Mr. Neale (perhaps fays the Estay-Writer) gave out no Commission, there is too much Reason to believe, that the Queen and her Popish Council, and even the King himself, was not unacquainted with the Defign of an In-

surrection, before it took place.

But why this invidious Construction upon the Conduct of his Majesty? Is there the least Grounds or Foundation for it? Not the leaft, as will appear immediately. It is faid, that the King never, by any publick Act or Declaration of his own, cleared himself of this Charge. -And supposing, for once, that he never did; does it follow from hence, that he was really guilty of it? Is it not rather a good Reason to incline. us to believe, that he was entirely innocent; and that his Innocence was one Reafon, why he took no public Notice of it? Does it appear, that the Parliament themselves ever really believed him to be guilty of it? This is certain, that they never publicly and expressly charged him with it; and was it confiftent with any the least Degree of Prudence, that a Prince should

vindicate

vindicate himself publicly from a Calumny, with which he was never publicly and expressly

charged?

If the Calumny was only whispered about to the Disadvantage of his Majesty's Character, a public Vindication of it had been a disproportionate Reply to a private and malicious Whisper. In this Case, the King was only to apply to such prudential Expedients for vindicating his Honour, as were consistent with his Innocence and the Dignity of his Station; and in this Respect, I presume, the impartial Reader will soon be convinced, that his Majesty's Behaviour was persectly agreeable to the Character of a pious, prudent, injured Prince.

The King at this Time was in Scotland, where he no fooner received Intelligence of the Rebellion in Ireland, but he communicated his Intelligence to the Parliament of Scotland, and wrote an Account of the Affair to the Parliament in England, earnestly pressing both Houses to send a speedy Aid to his Protestant Subjects

in Ireland.

The Rebellion daily increasing, his Majesty went further; and as soon as the Parliament in England, and the Lords Justices in Ireland, moved it to him, he ordered all, who were engaged in the Rebellion, to be proclaimed Rebels and Traitors;

And when the Parliament delayed to fend fuch Succours, as were necessary to reduce the Rebels to Obedience; and his Majesty found, that the Succours which they sent, were but

IJ 2

fmall

fmall and fitter to continue than end the War, he himself ordered such Forces for the Service of Ireland, as the Situation of his Affairs would admit of.

Now what could his Majesty have done more to wipe off the Imputation abovementioned? Do not these Acts amount to a public Declaration, nay, a strong presumptive Proof of his Innocence? Did he not hereby in effect defy his most inveterate Enemies to charge him with giving the least Countenance to the Rebellion? But did ever any of the Rebels after this Time accuse him of any such thing, or even of knowing any thing of their Defign? No; on the other hand, it is most certain, as hath been shewn already, that not one of them, who fell into the Hands of the Parliament Army, ever offered to accuse the King of being any ways concerned in the Rebellion; and some of them, just before their Execution, when they were going to appear before the great Tribunal of Heaven, declared folemnly, that they knew of no Commission from the King, and verily believed that the King knew nothing of the Defign of an Infurrection.

The Testimony of Lord Macguire to this Purpose is very remarkable. This Lord, we are told, was as deeply engaged in the Rebellion, and knew as much of the Measures which were taken, and of the Persons concerned in it, as any one; and yet denied to the last, that the Rebels had any Commission from the King; nay, he declared the King was so far from giving them

them a Commission, that he verily believed him to be utterly ignorant of the whole Transaction—to have had no Foreknowledge of their Defign. In this Declaration, it is said, that Macguire appeared to be a Man of more Conscience, than they who examined him, expected.

The Conduct of this Lord and another, just before their Execution, was perfectly agreeable to what Macguire had said upon his Examination. They voluntarily, and unasked, acquitted the King of being any ways privy to or con-

cerned in the Rebellion.

I shall only add the Testimony of Mr. Howel, which is too curious and material to be omitted. This Writer is very positive, that the King had no Intimation of the Insurrection, before the Design was carried into Execution, and assures us, that both the Spanish Ambassador and his Confessor told him, that the King knew no more of it than the Great Mogul. The Declaration of a Spanish Ambassador and his Confessor may appear trisling to some People, but with the Essay-Writer, and his Party, it can be liable to no Exception, they having frequently insisted upon it (and possibly not without Reason) that the Rebellion in Ireland was the Result of Popish Councils at home and abroad.

And yet, notwithstanding all this, and numerous other Proofs to the same Purpose, the Essay Writer, upon the Authority of two modern Historians—avowed Enemies to the religious Principles—to the established Religion, which the Royal Martyr professed, will have it, that

J 3 the

the King was not unacquainted with the Irish Insurrection — that he secretly favoured and encouraged it, he having never by any public Actor Declaration acquitted himself of the Imputation, no not in the Eikon Basilike, where he undertakes to vindicate his whole Conduct.

But is it possible, that any thing, which calls itself a Scholar or a Christian, can be capable of such Assertions? Assertions, which any one, who has read the Eikon Basilike, must know to

be absolutely false?

The King, in the Eikon Basilike, has, in the most solemn Manner declared not only his Innocence, but his utter Abhorrence of the very Imputation with which he is here charged [1].

He hath appealed to the Omniscient Being

for the Truth of his Declaration [2];

He has, in effect, declared that the Authors or Instigators of the Irish Rebellion and Blood-

Extracts from the Eikon Basilike, Chap. xii. upon the Rebellion and Miseries in Ireland.

[1] "It fell out, as a most unhappy Advantage to some Mens Malice against me, who, when they had Impudence enough to lay any thing to my Charge, this bloody Opportunity should be offered them, with which I must be aspersed. Although there was nothing which could be more abborred by me, being so full of Sin against God, Disloyalty to Myself, and destructive to my Subjects.

[z] "God knows, as I can with Truth wash my Hands in Innocency, as to any Guilt in that Rebellion; so I might wash them in my Tears, as to the sad Apprehensions, I had to see

it spread so far, and make such Watte.

"Deal with me (O my God) not according to Man's unjust Reproaches, but according to the Innocency of my Hands in thy Sight. shed, had done enough to subject themselves to

eternal Infamy and Mifery [3].

In a word, he voluntarily subjected himself to the severest Punishments and Curses of the Almighty, if his Conscience did not witness his Integrity [4]. And yet it is considertly infinuated, that this Prince secretly encouraged the Rebellion in Ireland; that he never, by any public Act or Declaration, cleared himself of so vile a Calumny, no not in the Eikon Basilike.

That the Reader may see, that I do not aggravate Matters, he is desired to read the sew Passages in the Margin transcribed from the Eikon Basilike, and left to consider, what Credit is due to the Essay-Writer and his celebrated Historians, or whether within the Compass of a Page, so many arrant Falshoods, and Misrepresentations are to be met with in any the most infamous Libel, that is extant.

The next Paragraph in this Essay-Writer, is equally remarkable. "What further, says he, "greatly strengthened the Suspicions of the

" People, that the King too much approved and

[3] "That Sea of Blood, which hath there been cruelly and barbarously shed, is enough to drown any Man in eternal both Infamy and Misery, whom God shall find the malicious Author

or Instigator of its Effusion."

^{[4] &}quot;If I have defired or delighted in the woful Day of my Kingdom's Calamities; if I have not earnestly studied and faithfully endeavoured the preventing and composing of these bloody Distractions, then let thy Hand be against me and my Father's House. O Lord, thou sees I have Enemies enough of Men; as I need not, so I should not dare thus to imprecate thy Curse on me and mine, if my Conscience did not witness my Integrity, which thou, O Lord, knowest right well." (See more to the same Purpose in the xiith Chapter of the Eirau Bacilian.)

" countenanced this Rebellion, was - That " though the Rebels had most impudently " ftyled themselves the Queen's Army, and professed, that the Cause of their rising was " to maintain the King's Prerogative; and the " Queen's Religion, &c. and though both "Houses of Parliament had humbly and ear-" neftly advised his Majesty to wipe away this " Scandal by proclaiming them Rebels and " Traitors, yet no Proclamation was fet forth " to that Purpose, till almost three Months. " after the breaking out of this Rebellion; and " then Command given, that but FORTY " COPIES should be printed, nor they pub-" lished, till further Directions from his Ma-" jesty. This was the more observable, by the " late contrary Proceedings against the Scots, " who were in a very quick and sharp Manner " proclaimed; and those Proclamations forth-" with dispersed with as much Diligence as " might be, throughout all the Kingdom, and " ordered to be read in all Churches, accom-" panied with public Prayers and Execrations." Here the Reader will observe, that there is a double Charge brought against his Majesty; viz.

1. That almost three Months intervened before he proclaimed the Irish — Rebels and Traitors, though both Houses humbly and earnestly
advised him so to do; whereas, no sooner did the
Scots appear in Arms, but a Proclamation was
issued out immediately, declaring them Rebels in
a very sharp Manner.

2. That

2. That as to the Proclamations against the Irish, Orders were given, that only Forty Copies should be printed, and that they should not be published, till further Directions from his Majesty.

As to the first Charge, to condemn the Actions of a Prince, because we cannot perhaps at the End of a Century precisely say, what were the Motives of them, is very extraordinary. However, even at this Distance of Time, some Reasons may be affigured to justify his Majesty's Conduct in this Respect; Reasons sufficient at least to satisfy the Reader, that the Charge is a base Insinuation, and no more to the Essay-Writer's Purpose — no more a Proof that the King secretly savoured the Irish Rebellion, than

that he favoured Mohammedism.

The Rebellion and Massacre in Ireland was confessedly a most horrid Scene of Wickedness and Barbarity, of which the King ought to have shewn the utmost Abhorrence and Detestation. He ought to have omitted no prudent Methods to check and suppress it. And was he guilty of any culpable Omissions in this Respect? Did he not earnestly press the Parliament to fend a speedy Aid to his Protestant Subjects in Ireland? And when his Majesty found that the Succours were delayed, and that the Parliament took little or no Care of the Affair, he offered to raise such Forces for the Service, as the Situation of his Affairs would admit of. And were not these the most prudent and likely Methods to check and suppress the Rebellion ?

But the King, it seems, did not immediately declare the Irish — Rebels and Traitors. And was it consistent with the prudential Measures, which are usually taken by Princes, to have done it immediately? Might not such a precipitate Proceeding have rather exasperated, than softened the Resentment of such desperate and bloody Men? The King, we all know, had some Friends amongst the Roman Catholicks, who never engaged in the Rebellion, and who continued attached to his Service to the very last; and might not such a Proclamation have alienated the Affections of the whole Body of Papists at home and abroad?

Did the Parliament in England, or the Lords Fustices of Ireland advise him, as soon as the Rebellion broke out, to proclaim them Rebels? No; and when they did, he readily complied with their Request. Upon the Report of a Committee, appointed to enquire into the Affairs of Ireland, the Parliament, some Time in December 1641 (nay, towards the latter End of that Month, if I mistake not) found, that one thing which obstructed the Relief of Ireland, was, that the Irish were not declared Rebels by Proclamation; and what was the Confequence? Why, the King immediately published a Proclamation (the Proclamation bears Date the very first Day of January 1641-2) wherein the Irifh were expressly declared to be Rebels and Traitors. (Rapin, Vol. II. p. 401.) And yet the Essay-Writer has infinuated, that almost three Months intervened, before the King could

could be perfuaded to proclaim them Rebels, tho both Houses of Parliament had humbly and earnestly advised his Majesty so to do. Base Mis-

representation!

The King had earneftly recommended to the Parliament the Confideration of the Affairs of Ireland, and offered to raise Ten thousand Men for that Service, if the Commons would only promife to pay them. But this Proposal was rejected, and Rapin has honeftly told us the Reasons of it. The Parliament, says he, forelaw, that a Breach would infallibly happen, and that then they should want the Troops, which the King had a Mind to engage them to fend into Ireland. After the Remonstrance of the Parliament, December 1, 1641, as every thing tended to a Rupture between the King and them, the Commons lost no Opportunity to infuse Sufpicions into the People against the King. They descended even to the meanest Trifles, to cherish their Fears and Jealoufies *.

They had Recourse to numerous Expedients to diffress the King. They would fend no Forces into Ireland, but fuch as they should approve of; fuch as should be independent of the Lord Lieu-. tenant of that Kingdom; they infifted upon

Nalson fays, "they fent down an Order to the Justices of Peace of Dorchefter, to make diligent Search for a Barrel of Powder,

fent thither for a Barrel of Soap." Tom. II. p. 719.

appointing

^{* &}quot;Upon Information, that amongst some Barrels of Soap, fent by a Merchant of London to Dorchester, there was found a Barrel of Gunpowder, the House appointed a Committee to make strict Inquisition, as into a thing of the greatest Consequence." (Rapin, Vol. II. p. 401.)

appointing the Officers. They chose rather, fays Rapin, to bazard the entire Loss of the Kingdom, than send thither Ten thousand English at fuch a Juncture. They therefore appointed a Committee to treat with the Scots for Succours: and at length they prevailed with them to offer Ten thousand Men for the Irish Service. And what was their Motive for this extraordinary Proceeding? Why, they concluded, fays Rapin, that if they (the Scotish Troops) were accepted, they should be freed from the Trouble and Danger of fending an English Army into Ireland; and if they were refused, the Delay of Relief would be imputed to the King. A MOST RIGHTEOUS, PEACEABLE, AND LOYAL RESOLUTION UN-DOUBTEDLY!

The King, however, to shew, that he sincerely withed the Suppression of the Irish Rebellion, consented to accept of the Assistance of the Scots, and only required, that the same Number of English Forces might be employed in the same Service. But this Proposition was likewise rejected with great Indignation; and the Commons, in a Conference, replied to the Lords—that as to the sending Ten thousand English into Ireland, they (the Commons) were not used to be capitulated with—that their Actions were free, as well without Conditions, as Capitulations, and desired it may be so no more.

In the mean time, the Succours for Ireland being by these Disputes retarded, and the Commons justly apprehending, that the Odium of it would

would be imputed to themselves, determined, if possible, to throw it upon the King. Accordingly they appointed a Committee to examine, from whence the Obstacles, which occurred in this Affair, might arise. And in order to divert the Attention of the Public from the main Point - in order to divert them from confidering, that the Parliament themselves (they who complained heavily that proper Forces were not fent to the Relief of the Protestants in Ireland) were the very Men, who obstructed them; in order to divert the People from observing the little artful Methods, which they were daily making use of for that Purpose, they had Recourse to an Expedient, which was likely to throw the Odium of it upon the King. They complained upon a Report of the Committee, that one thing which greatly obstructed the Relief of Ireland, was, that the Irish bad not been declared Rebels by Proclamation.

This was a Stratagem, which could not fail, they thought, to turn out to their Advantage. If the King refused to proclaim them [the Irish] Rebels, they knew, the Delay of Succours, would be imputed to the King; and if he ventured to proclaim them such, he would in all Probability disoblige some of his Roman Catholick Subjects, who professed a sincere Attachment to his Person and Service. However, amidst all these Inconveniences, no sooner did the Parliament complain of this Affair, but the King declared them [the Irish] Rebels and Traitors by Proclamation. And yet notwith-standing

standing all this, the King must be represented; as secretly countenancing the Irish Rebellion—as delaying to send those very Succours to the Relief of the Protestants in Ireland, which were afterwards brought into the Field of Battle and employed against him—In a word, he must be represented, as one who could not be persuaded for near three Months to proclaim them [the Irish] Rebels, though he actually did it within a few Days after the Parliament desired it. Nothing, surely, can parallel the hard Fate of this injured Prince—Nothing reach the Impudence and Virulence of his Libellers!

But why, it might be asked, was the King so very quick and sharp in declaring by Proclamation, the Scots to be Traitors and Rebels?

I answer, for a very plain and good Reason; because they justly deserved it. The treacherous and rebellious Behaviour of the Scots was attended with fuch aggravating Circumstances of Guilt and Ingratitude, as we feldom meet with in History. They knew his Majesty's distressed Condition. He was in Scotland, when he received the Intelligence of the Rebellion and borrid Massacre in Ireland, which he communicated to them. They not only made him the most solemn Promises of sincere Obedience, but had received fuch fingular Marks of his Royal Favour, as laid them under the highest Obligations of Loyalty and Fidelity. And yet, in January 1643, they concurred in the most undutiful Measures with the English Parliament, entered

entered the Kingdom with an Army, and appeared in open Rebellion against his Majesty. " About this Time, fays Lord Clarendon, no-" thing troubled the King fo much, as the " Intelligence he received from Scotland, that " they had already formed their Army, and " resolved to enter England in the Winter-Sea-" fon. All his Confidence, which he had " founded there upon the Faith and most so-" lemn Professions of particular Men, without " whom the Nation could not have been cor-" rupted, had deceived him to a Man, and " he found the same Men most engaged " against him, who had with most Solemnity " vowed all Obedience to him." (Clar. Vol. III. p. 411.)

2. The NEXT CHARGE is, that only Forty Copies of the Proclamation against the Rebels in

Ireland were printed, &c.

This Charge is so fully and clearly answered by Sir Edward Hyde, that I shall give it the Reader in his own Words:

"Concerning the Proclamation against the Rebels in Ireland, which, they say, they could not obtain in divers Months, and then that but Forty Copies were printed, and express Order given, that none should be published, till farther Directions; hear his Majesty's own full Answer to that Charge, in his Answer to the Declaration of the 19th of May, in these Words:—— It is well known, that we were, when that Rebellion broke forth, in Scotland; that we immediately from thence

" recommended the Care of that Business to " both Houses of Parliament here, after we " had provided for all fitting Supplies from our " Kingdom of Scotland; that after our Return " hither, we observed all those Forms for that " Service, which we were advised to by our " Council of Ireland, or both Houses of Par-" liament here; and if no Proclamation iffued " out sooner, it was because the Lords Justices " of that Kingdom defired them no fooner; " and when they did, the Number they defired was but TWENTY, which they advised might " be signed by us, which we, for the Expedition " of the Service, commanded to be printed (a " Circumstance not required by them) and there-" upon figned more than they defired. So that it is an impudent Affertion, that they could " not obtain a Proclamation in divers Months, " when they never fo much as defired or moved " it; and it was no fooner moved to the King, " but he gave Order in it in the same Hour. " But it will not be amis (fince this Parti-" cular hath been with fo much Confidence, " and fo often unreasonably objected against his " Majesty) to speak somewhat of the Custom " and Order usually observed in sending Pro-" clamations into that Kingdom, and of the "Reason, why so many and no more were at that " Time fent. " Except upon any extraordinary Reasons

"the King never signs more than the first "Draught fairly engrossed in Parchment, which being sent to the Lord Deputy or Lords "Justices

" Justices in Ireland is there printed, and the reprinted Copies dispersed, as they are in " England. His Majesty's Sign Manuel being " not to any of those Copies, the Lords Ju-" flices and Councit, taking Notice of the Ru-" mour, industriously spread amongst the Re-" bels, that they had the KING's Authority for " what they did, which might get Cfedit " amongst some, defired that they might have " TWENTY Proclamations fent over, figned by the King's Sign Manuel, to the end that " (befides the printed Copies, which they would " disperse according to Custom) they might be " able to fend an Original, with the King's " Hand to it, to those considerable Persons, whom " they might suspect to be missed by that false " Rumour, who, when they faw the King's own " Hand, would be without Excuse, if they per-" fifted.

"This Letter and Defire from the Lords
"Justices and Council was communicated to
the Council-Board, and the Resolution there
taken was, that they should have double the
Number they defired, signed by the King;
and because the ingrossing so many Copies
would take up more Time, Directions were
given for the printing Forty Copies, all which
were signed by his Majesty, and with als
possible Speed dispatched into Ireland; and
the Caution, that there should be no more
printed, was very necessary, less the Rebels,
by having Notice of it, should find some

" were fent, and be prepared to defend their old, or raise some new Scandal, upon his Maiesty; besides, there was no imaginable Rea-" fon, why any more should be printed in London." (See Appendix to the History of

the Grand Rebellion, p. 89, 90, &c.)

So that, upon the whole, the very Charge, which is here urged as a Reason for his Majefty's fecretly countenancing the Rebellion in Ireland, is a clear Evidence, that he had an utter Abhorrence of it, and that he took the most prudent, speedy, and necessary Steps to check and suppress it, that could be contrived for that Purpose.

It is observable, that upon so great an Emergency, the King, instead of fending over one Proclamation figned by himself (as usual) fent Forty, though the Lords Justices only defired

Twenty;

That this Number was transmitted, that the Lords Justices might be able to fend an Original, with the King's Hand to it, to those considerable Persons, whom they might suspect to be misled by false Rumours, and who, when they saw the King's very Hand, would be without Excuse, if they perfisted;

That because the ingrossing of so many Copies would take up a good deal of Time, the Forty Copies were ordered to be printed, and dispatched into Ireland with all possible Expedition;

That no more were ordered to be printed in England; Forty Copies with the Sign Manuel being furely enough to fend or shew to such confiderable Persons, as had been missed by false Rumours;

That none were to be published here, till further Directions, lest the Rebels, by having Notice of the Design, should find out some Device to evade the End, for which they were sent into Ireland. So that Forty and only Forty Copies were printed in England, for a Reason the most obvious and apparent; that they might effectually answer the End for which they were

defigned in Ireland.

This did not hinder the printing in Ireland as many Copies as should be thought necessary. The Lords Justices and Council in Ireland supposed that others were to be printed and dispersed throughout the Kingdom. They only defired, that Twenty Copies with the Sign Manuel might be sent over, to enable them to send an Original with the King's Hand to it, to some considerable Persons. They at the same Time, and in the same Letter, expressly intimate, that they should print other Copies, which they would disperse according to Custom.

And yet, because only Forty Copies were printed in England, the Essay-Writer and some others would infinuate, and make their Readers believe, that no more were printed in Ireland; whereas the true Reason, why Forty and no more were printed here, and strict Orders given, that none should be published, till surther Directions, was, that the Proclamation might have its due Effect in Ireland—that the Rebels might not be apprized of the Design—that

X 2

they might have no Opportunity to render it ineffectual, by fresh Lies and Calumnies upon his Majesty, and that they might be convinced by seeing those, who were engaged in the Rebellion, proclaimed Traitors under his Majesty's own Sign Manuel.

How greatly must a Writer be distressed, who is forced to urge such a Fact in Prejudice to the King's Conduct! A Fact, which so manifestly redounds to his Honour, and is so clear a Consutation of the very Calumny, which

it is brought to justify and support.

The following Paragraphs are so idle and impertinent, and so little to the Essay-Writer's Purpose, that it would be only wasting the Reader's and my own Time, to take any great Notice of them. The Charges relating

To the King's Refusal of a Commission to Lord

Brook and Lord Wharton;

To several Officers and Commanders being called away from the Irish Service by the express Command of the King;

To some Cloaths, &c. which were defigned for Ireland, being seized and detained by the King's

Soldiers and Servants:

To Sydney Earl of Leicester's being delayed and detained from going against the Rebels in Ireland. — All these Charges are so clearly and fully answered by Sir Edward Hyde (see Appendix, p. 92, 93, &c.) that nothing surely but the most consummate Ignorance, or Bigotry, or something worse, could have induced any Mortal living to have urged them as Reasons

for suspecting his Majesty of secretly savouring the Irish Rebellion. I shall therefore refer the Reader to what is said by that noble Author, and only observe a word or two with regard to the Case of Lord Brook and Lord Wharton, which may serve as a Specimen of the idle and trissing Nature of the rest of the Essay-Writer's Quotations to this Purpose. Their Case, in short, was this: — The Forces which were to be under their Command, were raised before his Majesty's Commission was so much as desired; and

The Commission which was defired, was to be independent of his Majesty's Lieutenant of Ireland.

These are very extraordinary Circumstances, and would naturally put a prudent Prince upon thinking; they would naturally make him very cautious, how he granted Commissions to Perfons, who were so very officious to obtain them, upon Terms which amounted to a Diminution of the regal Authority, which tended at least to render it of no Force or Weight in his Kingdom of Ireland. But this was not all. The King had Reason to suspect the Fidelity of those Gentlemen, who were to be intrusted with his Commission. Not long after these Commisfions were defired, the Forces which were raifed for the Relief of the Protestants in Ireland, and intended to be employed against the Rebels there, were brought into the Field, and employed against his Majesty at the Battle of Edgebill. Whether the King had not good Reason to refuse a Commission to Men, who were to com- X_3 mand

mand such Troops, let the Reader judge. I shall only beg Leave to add, that this Charge was answered by the King himself in such a Manner, that the Truth of his Answer was never disputed, nor even a Reply made to it,

(Clar. Hift. Vol. H. B. vi.)

The next Particular surged by the Essay-Writer, which deserves the least Notice, is, That the King consented to a Cessation of Arms, and afterwards to a Peace with the Irish Rebels. But as this Charge has been partly obviated already, and will be more fully considered in the following Pages, it would be needless to say a great deal to it in this Place. However, a word or two in Reply to a few Particulars may not be amis.

" The Parliament of Ireland, Lord Clarenso don informs us, fent Commissioners to the " King, in the Name of the Protestants in that Kingdom, to prevent the making any Peace, and with a Petition to dissolve the Cessation " which had been made; and Commissioners " also came from the Lord Lieutenant and " Council, whereof some were of the Privy-" Council, affuring the King, that there could so be no Security for the Protestants in that "Kingdom, but by leaving the Irish without any Capacity or Ability to trouble them; for " their Perfidiousness was such, that they could " not be trusted; and therefore they must be " put into fuch a Condition, by being totally disarmed, that they should not be able to do " any Mischief, or that all the Protestants must

" leave

leave the Kingdom to the entire Possession of the Irish *." But notwithstanding all this, the Essay-Writer tells us, that the King resolved to grant the Irish whatever they demanded—especially in point of Religion †. And that the EARL of GLAMORGAN was employed and authorized to treat with those bloody Rebels.

As to GLAMORGAN'S pretended Commiffion, it will be confidered in the next Chapter, to which therefore I refer the Reader [1]. At present I shall only take the Liberty to transcribe from Lord Clarendon (the very Author, which the Essay-Writer here quotes) what was offered in Reply to the above Charge at the Treaty of Uxbridge [2].

* Esay, p. 117. + Esay, p. 118.

[1] See the next Chapter.

The Letter, which the Effay-Writer (p. 120.) tells us, that the King wrote to the Earl of Glamorgan, is likewise proved, in the following Chapter, to be an arrant Forgery. The base and invidious Resections which, upon the Strength of the said Letter, the Essay-Writer has made upon the King's Conduct,

must of Consequence be utterly groundless.

[2] Lord Clarend. Hift. Vol. II. p. 590. 8vo Edit. Here the Ingenuity of the Essay-Writer is particularly remarkable. He has here endeavoured to impose upon his Readers in such a barefaced and shameful Manner, as is seldom to be met with. In his Presace he has these Words:—" The Method bere taken "will be thought, it is presumed, the most likely to come at the "Knowledge of the Truth; which is to call, as it were, a Council of the most celebrated Historians, and Writers of those Times, "and to give the Reader the Satisfaction of bearing them stand "forth and each in his own Words pronouncing upon" the Case."

Now after this pompous Declaration, after these great Pretensions to Impartiality, when this Essay-Writer quotes one of the celebrated Historians which he here speaks of, would not any one conclude, that he would give us the real Sentiments of that Historian? — that he would give his Readers the Satisfactorian.

"When they [the Commissioners from the " Parliament 1 entered upon the Bufiness of " Ireland, they thought they had the King at " very great Advantage; and that his Com-" miffioners would not be able to answer the * Charges they should make upon that Particular. " And many of the Commissioners on the "King's Part, who had not been well acquaint-" ed with those Transactions, thought it would be a hard Matter to justify all that the King " had been necessitated to do; and any thing " of Grace towards the Irish Rebels was as " ungracious at Oxford, as it was at London; " because they knew the whole Kingdom had " a great Deteffation of them. They ripped " up all that had been done from the Beginning " of that Rebellion; kow the King had volunstarily committed the carrying on that War " to the two Houses of Parliament; that they " had levied great Sums of Money upon the " Kingdom for that Service; but finding, that " it was likely to bring a greater Burthen upon " the Kingdom than it could bear; that his " Majesty had consented to an Act of Parlia-" ment for the Encouragement of Adventurers " to bring in Money, upon Affurance of having

faction of hearing him stand forth and in his own Words pronouncing upon the Case? And yet in the above Passage, and in several other Instances, he has quoted Lord Clarendon for Historical Facts, which that noble Historian only mentioned, with an Intention to obviate and consute; and which he has actually obviated and consuted in the very same Pages, which the Essay-Writer here refers to (See Clar. Hist. Vol. II. p 589, 590, &c.)

" Land

" Land affigned to them in that Kingdom, out " of the Forfeitures of the Rebels, as foon as " the Rebellion should be suppressed; and had " likewise by the same Act put it out of his " Power to make any Peace or Ceffation with " those Rebels, or to grant Pardon to any of " them without Confent of Parliament; and " thereupon many of his Majesty's Subjects had " brought in very confiderable Sums of Money, " by which they had been able to manage that "War without putting this Kingdom to further " Charge; and God had so bleffed the Pro-" testant Forces there, that they had subdued " and vanguished the Rebels in all Encounters; " and probably by that Time the whole Re-" bellion had been extinguished, if the King " had not, contrary to his Promise and Obli-" gation by that Act of Parliament, made a " Ceffation with those execrable Rebels, when " they were not able to continue the War; and " had called over many of those Regiments, " which the Parliament had fent over against " the Irish, to return hither to fight against " the Parliament; by Means whereof his Pro-" testant Subjects of that Kingdom were in " great Danger to be destroyed, and the King-" dom to be entirely possessed by the Papists. " They enlarged themselves upon this Subject, " with all the invidious Infinuations they could " devise, to make the People believe, that the " King was inclined to and favoured that Re-" bellion. They demanded, that the King " would forthwith declare that Ceffation to be

" yoid; and that he would profecute the War " against those Rebels with the utmost Fury; " and that the Act of Parliament for their Re-" duction might be executed as it ought to be. " The Commissioners of the King prepared " and delivered a very full Answer in Writing " to all their Demands; at the Delivery whereof. " they appointed the Chancellor of the Exchequer " to enlarge upon any of those Particulars, " which proved the Counsels that had been " taken, just and necessary. This he did so " particularly and convincingly, that those of " the Parliament were in much Confusion, and " the King's Commissioners much pleased. He " put them in mind of their bringing those " very Troops, which were levied by the King's " Authority for the Suppression of the Rebel-" lion in Ireland, to fight against the King at " Edgebill, under the Command of the Earl of " Effex; of their having given over the Profe-" cution of that War, or fending any Supply " of Arms, Money, or Ammunition thither; " having employed those Magazines, which were " provided for that Service, against his Majesty; " infomuch as the Privy-Council of that King-" dom had fent to his Majesty, that he would or provide some other Way for the Preservation " of that Kingdom, fince they could not be " able to support the War any longer, against " the united Power of the Rebels; that all "Overtures, which his Majesty had made to-" wards Peace, had been rejected by the Par-" liament, and One hundred thousand Pounds, " brought

" brought in by the Adventurers for Ireland. " had been fent in one entire Sum into Scot-1 land, to prepare and dispose that Kingdom " to fend an Army to invade this; which they " had done, and till then his Majesty had not " in the least Degree swerved from the Obser-" vation of that Act of Parliament; but when " he faw that the Parliament, instead of pro-" fecuting the End and Intention of that Sta-" tute, applied it wholly to the arrying on the "War against himself, he thought himself ab-" folved before God and Man, if he did all he " could to rescue and defend himself against " their Violence, by making a Ceffation with " the Rebels in Ireland, and by drawing over " fome Regiments of his own Army from " thence to affift him in England; which " Cessation had hitherto preserved the Pro-" testants of that Kingdom; who were not " able without Supplies to preserve themselves " from the Strength and Power of the Rebels; " which Supplies his Majesty could not, and the " Parliament would not, fend; and therefore " if the Protestants there, should hereafter be " oppressed by the Rebels, who every Day pro-" cured Affistance from abroad, and so were " like to be more powerful, all the Mischiefs " and Miseries that must attend them, would, " before God and Man, be put to the Account " of the Parliament; which had defrauded them " of those Supplies, which by his Majesty's " Care had been raised and provided for them; " and not to his Majesty, who had done nothing, ce but

" but what he was obliged to do for his own " Preservation; and if he had not sent for those " Soldiers from Ireland, they could not have " staid there without a Supply of Money, " Cloaths, and Provisions; which the Parlia-" ment had not yet fent to that Part of the " Army, which remained there, and which could by no other Way have subsisted, but " by the Benefit and Security of the Ceffation. " He told them, that all this unjustifiable "Way of proceeding, though it had compelled " the King to yield to a Ceffation, yet could " not prevail with him to make a Peace with " the Irish Rebels; from whom he had ad-" mitted Commissioners to attend him with " Propositions to that Purpose; but that, when " he found those Propositions and Demands so " unreasonable, that he could not consent to " them in Conscience, and that they were inconfistent with the Security of his Protestant " Subjects there, he had totally rejected them, " and difmiffed their Commissioners with severe " and sharp Animadversions; yet that he had " given his Lieutenant and Council there, Au-" thority to continue the Ceffation longer, in " hope that the Rebels there might be reduced " to better Temper; or that his Majesty might " be enabled by a happy Peace here, which he " hoped this Treaty would produce, to chastife " their odious and obstinate Rebellion; and if " the Parliament would give his Majesty suf-" ficient Caution, that the War should be " vigorously prosecuted there against the Irish, " by " by fending over strong Supplies of Men and "Money, he would put an End to that Cef-

" fation without declaring it to be void; which

" otherwise he could not in Justice do, and the

"doing whereof, would be to no Purpose." (Clarend. Hist. Vol. II. p. 590, &c. 8vº Edit.)

A few Words more, and I shall beg to take my Leave of a Writer of as extraordinary Qualifications (Oldmixon not excepted) as this Age hath produced. The Essay-Writer speaking of the Marquis of Antrim, and quoting a Passage from Mr. Neale, and another from Mr. Pierce (p. 126.) concludes to the following Purpose.

Here is a great deal of Bloodshed, says he, in many black Instances proved upon Antrim, before the Earl of Northumberland, and the Committee in Council; but he produces Letters from the King [Charles I.] warranting and authorizing him to do as he had done.— Who now, after such Evidence, can think the Character of this unhappy Prince free from deep Stain, as to the Irish Rebellion?

And if the King's Letters did really authorize the Marquis to commit such Bloodshed, the Essay-Writer's Conclusion must be admitted. But if the Marquis had no Hand in the Irish

Massacre, the Bloodshed alluded to;

If the King's Letters of Instruction [the Letters which were read before the Earl of Northumberland, and the Committee in Council] bore Date at least two Years after all this Bloodshed, and could have no Relation to it;

If the Letters were written in 1643-4; if they related to a very different Affair, and only authorized the Marquis to correspond with the Rebels, in order to reduce them to Obedience, and to get some Forces transported into Scotland to the Assistance of the Marquis of Montrose; if all this has been clearly proved *, what must we think of Writers, who have concealed the Dates of the King's Letters, wrote in 1643-4, and would make their Readers believe, that they were Warrants and Instructions to the Marquis of Antrim, for the Cruelties, the horrid Bloodshed and Murders committed in 1641?

Many horrid and black Instances of Bloodshed and Gruelty, says the Essay-Writer, had been proved upon Antrim; but he undeniably shewed, that he had acted by the King's WARRANT IN WHAT HE HAD DONE; and King Charles II. assirms, and gives it under his Hand, that all his Actings with the bloody Irish, were authorized, directed, and approved by his Royal Father. Accordingly Antrim was acquitted and his forfeited Estate restored. The Guilt therefore of his Actings must lie at Another's Door +.

These, the Essay-Writer's own Words, with a very sew Alterations, will set his Ingenuity and Regard for Truth in a clear Light. — Many horrid and black Instances of Bloodshed and Cruelty were laid to the Charge of the Marquis of Antrim, and it is said by the Essay-Writer and his Party, that the King authorized him to do what he did. But it has been

* Page 274, 275. + P. 128. undeniably

undeniably (hewn, that the Marquis had no Hand in the Murders and Cruelties which were committed in 1641, and that the King at that Time had given him no Warrant for what he did, either good or bad. And King Charles II. affirmed, and gave it under his Hand, that the King his Father's Infructions to the Marquis related to his Actings in 1643-4 - That his Actings about that Time were authorized, directed, and approved of by his Royal Father: Accordingly Antrim was acquitted, and his forfeited Estates restored. - The Guilt therefore of laying more to the Charge of the Marquis than he really deferved - The Guilt of loading the Memory of an unfortunate Prince with authorizing him to commit the most horrid Murders and Cruelties, must lie at ANOTHER'S DOOR.

I have now done with the Effay-Writer, as to the Irish Massacre; and could heartily wish, that I had no Occasion to mention him in the remaining Part of my Design. A Writer of such extraordinary Accomplishments is evidently below all Consideration but that of Pity or Contempt. In the few Remarks, which are already made upon his Performance (I appeal to the impartial World) it is, I think, clearly shewn, that he has not a single Qualification

which deferves Efteem;

That amidst all his Pretensions to Impartiality, he has paid as little Regard to Truth, as any, the most infamous Writer, that is extant;

That his Intention could be no other, than to impose upon and mislead illiterate Readers;

That

That he has given them, for Facts, feveral Particulars, which be must know to be false, and disguised and misrepresented others, which he must know to be true. And whenever he shall make it appear, that he has two Pages in his whole Libel, absolutely free from one or more of those Faults, with which I have charged him; that he has two whole Pages free from Falfbood or Misrepresentation - free from some idle and impertinent Quotations - from Quotations which are either tortured to speak a Sense, that the Authors never meant, or from fuch, as are nothing to his Purpose - in one word, free from some base Reflection - some invidious Infinuation, that hath a mischievous Tendency (except what regards the present Family upon the Throne) I will publicly acknowledge much more than I have hitherto been able to discover. I will acknowledge, that he is a Writer of greater Abilities, of less Partiality, and more Importance, than any Man of Learning or Integrity in the Kingdom can or will allow him. With fuch Men, he hath met with that Contempt which he deferves. I am only concerned for honest unlearned Readers, whom he has manifestly endeavoured to alarm and abuse.

If this was not his Intention, why has he taken such Pains to asperse the Memory of a Protestant Prince, and justify the most horrid Rebellion, that we meet with upon Record? Why (in the present Reign especially) has he endeavoured to give his Readers such savourable Notions of the most factious, the most unconstitutional

stitutional and republican Principles? He himfelf has acknowledged, that under the prefent Family we have enjoyed the Blessing of a gentle Government, beyond what the happiest of our Ancestors could boast. What Occasion then for fuch virulent Declamations upon a pious, protestant, murdered Prince? Why such Encouragement to Rebellion? Why fuch impudent and odious Comparisons between the Measures taken at the Revolution and the Grand Rebellion? Is there any just Similitude between them? Did not King Charles redrefs every Grievance which was complained of by the Parliament and the People? And after this Period, can the Effay-Writer acquit those, who took up Arms against him, of the most impious and deliberate Rebellion?

But was this the Cafe at the Revolution? Did not King James II. obstinately persist in his Encroachments upon our Rights and Privileges, civil and sacred? Did he not openly avow his Design of subverting the established Religion, and introducing Popery? Hear only what he said himself, after he lest the Kingdom. He in essect declared, that he sat with Pleasure under the Loss of his three Kingdoms, since he could not establish the Catholic Religion; i. e. the superstitious Practices of the Church of Rome.

With what Design then can this Writer suggest a Resemblance between the Revolution and the Grand Rebellion? With what Design can this be done, unless to unsettle the Minds of the Y People,

People, and prepare them for fome extraordinary Work, which may involve us in the dreadful Miseries and Calamities of the last Century? One Reason assigned by the Rebels for their Behaviour in 1641, was, that the established Church was deficient in Purity - that it was not pure enough for the Saints of that loyal and enlightened Age; that as they had a Right to promote the pure Religion of their Redeemer, they (like Mohammed) had a Right to disturb the Peace of Governments - to overturn Kingdoms, and put an End to every thing, which did not exactly coincide with their Notions of Religion and Liberty. Accordingly, it is well known, they never ceased to persist in their rebellious Proceedings, till they had subverted the Constitution in Church and State.

When therefore a Writer shall endeavour to justify the Behaviour of those Men; when he shall palliate and approve of the Measures taken at the Grand Rebellion, and represent them equally defensible with those taken at the Revolution, what is it less than in effect telling the People, that they have a Right to act over the horrid Scene again — that they have a Right to rebel against any Prince, where the established Religion is not exactly agreeable to their own

Way of thinking?

The established Church is now the same as in the Reign of King Charles; and though it was then subverted by unreasonable Men, yet the Essay-Writer has not scrupled to justify what they

they did; and that in a Reign, when he and his Party enjoy every Privilege civil and religious, that can reasonably be desired by a People, who resuse Obedience to the Laws of the Establishment. With what View this is done, I think, there is no great Sagacity required to discover.

What the Essay-Writer has advanced to this Purpose has an evident Tendency to promote the most factious — the most rebellious Principles and Practices; and amounts to nothing less than the very Calumny — the very Reproach to the Revolution, which he himself has charged upon those, who call the Civil War in the Reign of King Charles, the Grand Rebellion.

To call, says he, the Civil War the Great Rebellion, is to reproach the Revolution; to strike at the Foundation of our present happy Settlement, and to shake the Right of his sacred

Majesty to bis Throne.

To call Things by their proper Names, is no Reflection upon any Prince or Government whatfoever, especially when by the Laws of that Government, we are warranted to call them fuch. But to compare the Revolution with the Grand Rebellion is the very Calumny, which this Writer complains of; it having an evident Tendency to reproach the Revolution, and to put his Majesty's Title to the Crown upon a Footing, which none but an indulged, ungrateful Dissenter would have dared to put it.

The Defign of this impudent Reflection is Y 2 obvious obvious. It is intended to screen the Ancestors of a Party from the Imputation of being Rebels and Traitors, and plainly shews, how greatly a Writer must be distressed, who, in order to vindicate them from this black and heavy Charge, is forced to have Recourse to an Artifice, which amounts to a Diminution of his Majesty's Title to the Crown; which supposes the Revolution to be no better than the Grand Rebellion—no better than what the Statute has expressly called the rebellious Proceedings of cruel and bloody Men.

This unparalleled Impudence of the Effay-Writer deserves a much severer Rebuke, and since he and his Party talk so much of their Loyalty, since they would fain be thought bis Majesty's best Subjects, let us see how that

Matter stands.

The Essay-Writer has more than once made the most solemn Protestations of his Zeal for, and Attachment to, the present Family upon the Throne. But how shall we be assured of the Sincerity of this Gentleman? His Predecessors made the like Protestations, and yet dethroned and murdered poor King Charles. Cromwell, when, in all Probability, he had intended to murder him, pressed his Hand between his own, in a most affectionate Manner, and declared with Tears, that he had the sincerest Regard for his Person and Service. The Rebels in general assured him, that they earnestly prayed for his Welfare; that they took

took up Arms for the Preservation of his Person and Government, even when they were preparing to enter the Field of Battle, with a desperate Resolution to destroy him and his Adherents.

How then shall we be assured of the Loyalty of the Essay-Writer? How shall we be assured, that he has not some further Design in writing this Essay of his? He has plainly infinuated, that the Conduct of those rebellious Hypocrites in King Charles's Time was justifiable——That amidst all their Protestations and Prayers for his Majesty, they were at least fully warranted in taking up Arms against him——That their Rebellion was as defensible as the Revolution, though, as I observed before, King James openly avowed a Design of subverting the established Religion and introducing Popery, which it is most certain King Charles never did. But this by the by.

The pure and holy Religion established amongst us, it seems, is not pure enough for the Essay-Writer and his Friends; it wants, in their Opinion, great Reformation; and I am confident, they would take it much amis, should I doubt their Readiness to appear in Defence of that Schism, which they call pure and undefiled Religion, or to resist any Prince, who should obstruct or abridge them in the Exercise of it. These being the avowed Principles of the Essay-Writer and his Friends, let

us fee

Whether such Men can be good Subjects to any Prince or Government upon Earth where their own schismatical Profession is not established?

Whether their most solemn Protestations are a sufficient Security for their Obedience and good Behaviour?

Whether the kindest Indulgence can restrain them from disturbing the Peace of a Community when an Opportunity offers for that Purpose?

These Questions we shall be best able to refolve, by enquiring what has been usually done by Gentlemen of the Essay-Writer's Principles in Cases of the like kind.

King Charles I. was no Friend to Popery, as hath been clearly shewn already; and his Zeal for the true, primitive, reformed Religion, established in these his Dominions, was unquestionably great. He was a Churchman upon Principle. He understood the Controversy between the Church of England and the Church of Rome and all other Diffenters, as well as most Divines in the Kingdom; and nothing feems to have afflicted him more, than when he was pressed to make indefensible Alterations in the established Religion, which he knew to be more agreeable to the pure Religion of his Redeemer - to the Doctrine, the Government, the Difcipline, and Worship of the primitive Church, than any other publicly professed upon the Face of the Earth. In this Case, like a primitive Martyr,

Martyr, he determined rather to lose his Crown and his Life, than be forced into any sinful Compliance by violent Measures. Had he given up the Mitre, it is well known, he might have saved his Crown; but violent Motions, says he, which are neither manly, christian, nor loyal, shall never either shake or settle my Religion, nor any Man's else, who knows what Religion means; — The Laws and Constitutions relating to the English Church are not yet repealed, nor are like to be for me, till I see more rational and religious Motives, than Soldiers use to carry in their Knapsacks *.

But besides the King's zealous Attachment to the established Church, he was obliged by his Coronation Oath to support it, nor could he without a Breach of it, have given his Consent to any considerable Alteration in the Constitution, civil or religious. And how did the Essay-Writer's Predecessors behave upon this Occasion? Did they steddily adhere to their Prince? Did they consider the Dissiculties he laboured under? Did they consider, that he could not in Conscience have made the Alterations which were desired?

The King fincerely believed, that the established Church came the nearest to the primitive and apostolical Church of Christ, of any upon Earth. In his Disputes with Mr. Henderson and others, he urged such Arguments for his religious

^{*} Einer Basilin, Chap. xiii.

Sentiments, as never were, never will, nor never can be answered. Hender son himself in effect acknowledged as much upon his Death-Bed, and heartily repented, that he had gone fo far in opposing and encouraging the Opposition made to fo good a Prince. But did the King's Enemies in general think in this Manner? Did they consider, that upon their own Principles his Majesty's Compliance with Demands which he believed to be finful, must have been finful in him, whether absolutely so or not? Did they confider Things in this generous and humane Light? No; on the other hand, they never paid the least Regard to the Plea, which their Successors have fince so often and so strongly urged in favour of tender Consciences; but plainly told the King, that there was no Peace to be expected till he granted them their Demands; that nothing should induce them to lay down their Arms till he confented to the utter Subversion of the Constitution in Church and State, which he had fworn to preferve. And when, in pursuance of this bumane, this pious, and loyal Resolution, they had prevailed upon the Scots to come in to their Affistance, it is well known, that they never ceased to perfift in their rebellious Behaviour, till they had reduced his Majesty to such Extremities, as ended in the most horrid Scene of Anarchy and Confusion — in the most barbarous and deliberate Murder of a fovereign Prince, that we meet with in the Annals of the Christian or Heathen 4

Heathen World. And why then, I would fain know, are we to suppose, that the Essay-Writer and his Friends would not, in the same Situation, fall into the same Measures? Would not be guilty of the same Practices if an Opportunity offered? This Writer every where endeavours to justify, at least to palliate, the Behaviour of the King's Enemies, and all their rebellious Proceedings tending to the Subversion of the Government. His Essay is professedly written for that Purpose. What Reason then can be given, why he and his Friends would not, under the same Circumstances, act the very same Part, and play over their old

Game again?

Have these Men, amidst all their Declarations of Zeal for the present Establishment, been remarkable for any extraordinary Acts of Loyalty in the Reigns subsequent to that of King Charles? It is not unufual, I am fenfible, to hear these these Gentlemen, under the Pretence of a peculiar Attachment to the Civil Constitution, arrogating to themselves the Title of bis Majesty's best Subjects. But is it likely, that those Men should be bis Majesty's best Subjects, who only pay a partial Obedience to the Laws of their Country? — Who have never yet been found faithful or fincere to any Government upon Earth? — Who have been more than once in a Combination with Papifts to diffress the established Church? - whose open and avowed Principles are Faction, Treachery,

and Disobedience? — Who, under the Mask of Moderation and Charity, upon the least Disgust or Disappointment, have pursued their Opponents with the utmost Cruelty, Bitterness,

railty of the lame Paulin

and Revenge?

The Discussion of such Questions, is what I have always industriously avoided, and sincerely abhorred, it being the fixed Principle of every true Member of our Church to live peaceably, if possible, with all Men. But when the Symptoms of a Mortification appear, it is highly necessary that the Wound should be probed to the Bottom. The Reader therefore will give me Leave to trespass upon his Patience a Moment, whilst I set this Matter in a clear Light.

In a late Reign, when the Members of our Communion made the most glorious Stand against Popery, that ever was made since the Reformation, it is well known, that the Ancestors of those, who arrogate to themselves the Title of his Majesty's best Subjects, basely deserted their Protestant Brethren, addressed a Popish Prince in Terms of the most sulforme Flattery, and joined the inveterate Enemies of the reformed Religion, in Prejudice to the

established Church.

Under the present Government, the Behaviour of these best of Subjects, has been no less remarkable. His Majesty, out of a princely and paternal Regard for all his People, has favoured them with the tenderest Marks of his Affection and

[331]

and Goodness. And what is the Return which they have made for these Instances of Royal Favour and Indulgence? Why, they have very modeftly defired a greater Indulgence: They have defired, that the Constitution may be altered; that the fundamental Laws of the Kingdom may be repealed in their favour; that the Fences and Barriers of the Establishment may be thrown down; that they may enjoy the Benefits and Emoluments of a Church, which they would gladly overturn to-morrow; that Heretics, Arians, and Infidels of almost all Denominations, may have Liberty to enter the Walls of our Sion — to profane her Altars — to betray her into the Hands of her Enemies, and make us ridiculous to the whole Christian World. And when they could not be indulged in their unreasonable Demands, when they could not persuade our Governors to subvert the Constitution, what was the Consequence? Why, they were greatly difgusted at them; and treated their best Friends, Men in Authority and in the highest Stations, with the most unchristian Bitterness and Contempt. The Patriot was immediately unmasked. The Minister, who had served them to the utmost of his Power; who had procured for them the greatest Favours imaginable, was purfued with the most inveterate Malice and Refentment.

I would be far from doing these best of Subjests any Injustice, or laying the least Article

to their Charge, but what they deferve. With Respect to the late Rebellion, it does not appear that they ever gave the least Countenance to it : but then their Brethren in Scotland, it is well known, were deeply engaged, at least not innocent; the Rebel Army being made up chiefly of bigoted Papists, of misguided Zealots, of desperate, necessitous Scots Libertines, and false, defigning, traiterous, Scots Presbyterians. And yet this is the Party of Men, who arrogate to themselves the Title of bis Majesty's best Subjests; when it is notorious, that not a fingle Member of the Church of England, of any Confequence or Character - none but an abandoned. perjured Wretch, a Difgrace to his Profession, was in the leaft concerned in the whole Affair.

The last Attack made upon our Constitution by these best of Subjects; their last public Effort to disturb the Peace of the Community, and alienate the Affections of the People from the Establishment, is such a Scene of Treachery, Prevarication, shocking Impiety, and ungrateful Disobedience to their Governors, as is scarce to be paralleled in History.

When they found they could not be indulged in the Subversion of our Constitution, they had Recourse to every little Artifice, which could be thought of to accomplish their Defign. They made no Scruple to call in the Aid of the basest Prevarication, of the basest Calumnies and Falshoods, and were guil-

ty of the most insolent Menaces, the most horrid Impiety, and Disobedience to their Governors.

Since they could not have the established Church modelled according to their own ignorant and illiterate Fancies, they seemed refolved, with a Jesuitical Madness to leave us, if possible, without any Religion at all. Accordingly they made use of every Expedient, that the Wit or Wickedness of Man could invent, to impose upon our People, and give them mean and contemptible Sentiments of the public Devotions. To this End, amidst the . greatest Indulgence, and in open Defiance of the Laws, they impugned and libelled our Liturgy, and our Constitution. Having raked together all the little Cavils and Objections. which from Time to Time, had been made to our Liturgy, and which had been answered a hundred Times over, they carefully dispersed them throughout the Nation, and put them into the Hands of Numbers, who perhaps are not in a Capacity to obviate or examine them. The Consequence of such an Expedient is too obvious not to be foreseen. By this Means, the Minds of the People may be greatly perplexed, if not utterly prejudiced and unfettled. In proportion as Difficulties are thrown in their Way, their Zeal for the public Devotions must abate, and their Attendance upon one of the most folemn Duties of Religion become at length a Matter of more Indifference (if poffible)

fible) than it is at present. — However such Consequences had no Insluence upon these best of Subjects. No Consideration whatsoever, neither their Duty to God, or the Obedience which they owe to their Governors; neither a Regard for Religion, or the public Peace, could restrain them from doing what was right in their own Eyes. Without the least Proof or Foundation, they charged our Liturgy with all the Desects — with all the Faults, Improprieties, and Corruptions, which had been suggested by Papists, by Heretics, by Enthusiass, and the most inveterate Enemies of our Constitution.

And, what is still worse, for Fear they should not have a proper Instruence upon the People; for Fear the People should say, That an Enemy had done this, they by the most solemn and repeated Instructions declared themselves to be true and dutiful Sons of the established Church.

"With what Intention, as a late Writer ignifily observes, could this be done, unless to preposses the People against the Liturgy, and the Establishment, and then to play over their old Game again? If this was not their Intention, why was Recourse had to so many and such mean Arts and Disguises? Why did they pretend to be what they really were not? Why did they pretend to be true and dutiful Sons of the established Church? Why was all this done, unless to impose

" upon

" upon the Public, and draw in some of the unguarded Members of our Church to efpouse their Cause, and affist them in carrying on their treacherous and mischievous

"Defign?
"Their Defign was evidently not to reform, but to destroy; not to get some little Alterations made in our Liturgy; not to get some fancied Blemishes, and obsolete Words (as they are pleased to call them) altered and amended (for this, they have plainly told us, will not satisfy them) but utterly to deface the Beauty of our public Devotions, to throw down the Fences and Barriers of our Establishment, and expose us to the Incursion of Heretics, of Arians, Socinians, and a Rabble of Insidels of almost all Denominations."

Such is the Moderation, such the Charity, such the Loyalty, such the Piety and Integrity, of the Essay-Writer and his Friends, — of Men, who assume to themselves the Title of his Majesty's hest Subjects. Whether upon the Whole the Advocates for such Principles and Practices can be good Subjects to any Prince or Government upon Earth, where their own schismatical Profession is not established;

Whether their most solemn Protestations are a sufficient Security for their Obedience and good Behaviour;

Whether

Whether the kindest Indulgence can restrain them from disturbing the Peace of a Community, when an Opportunity offers for that Purpose, Men of Sense and Candour are lest to determine.

I have now done (I fincerely hope) with the Essay-Writer, and shall return to my Subject. It must not be concealed, that we are alarmed with fresh and strange Discoveries. If his Majesty King Charles I, had no Hand in the Irish Massacre, yet still we are told, that his Connexion with the Irish Rebels in the fubsequent Parts of his Reign; in the Years 1643, 44, 45, 46, is by no Means defensible; " that a good Man will always scruple the Use " of some Means, however just his Cause may " be; that a good Prince will never profecute " his regal Rights by fuch Methods as tend " to the inevitable Ruin of his Country; er and that a good Protestant will abhor " the Re-establishment of his Civil Autho-" rity, by endangering the Safety of his " own Religion, throughout his own Domi-" nions *."

Give me Leave therefore in the next Place to examine and see, what these new Discoveries are, and how far they affect the Character of the Royal Martyr.

^{*} See Preface to An Enquiry into the Share which K. Charles,

The END of the FIRST VOLUME.